THE

COMPLAINTS

OF THE

POOR PEOPLE

OF

ENGLAND:

CONTAINING

REMARKS

PART I.

I. On Government.

PART II.

I. II. The Defects in the Engliſh Government, as to Repreſentation.

III. The Ignorance of the Poor, and the Imperfection of the Laws.

IV. Diſproportion between Crimes and Puniſhments.

V. Capital Puniſhments.

PART III.

I. The Royal Houſehold, and Public Expenditure.

II. The Church.

III. The Law-Courts.

IV. The Army.

V. The Navy.

VI. Schools.

VII. Poor-Rates, and Poor-Houſes.

VIII. Public Hoſpitals.

IX. Priſons.

X. Feudal and Seignoral Rights, Labourers, and Manufacturers.

PART IV.

I. Addreſs to the Friends of Reform.

II. Balance of Opinions.

III. Price of Proviſions and Labour. Rules for Provident Societies; Free Schools; Workhouſes; Addreſs of Ladies at Walworth; of Mr. Muir, and Mr. F. Palmer.

By G. DYER, B. A.

LATE OF EMANUEL COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

SECOND EDITION,

CORRECTED, ALTERED, AND MUCH ENLARGED.

FIAT JUSTITIA.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. RIDGWAY, YORK STREET, ST. JAMES'S;

AND

H. D. SYMONDS, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

1793.

[Entered at Stationers' Hall.]

2/-

47
10 9
97

THE

COMPLAINTS, &c.

INTRODUCTION.

THE ſubjects, which I am about to examine, appear to me of importance; but, as they relate immediately to the poor, I muſt firſt beg leave to obſerve, that I have many reaſons for being intereſted in their happineſs. It has been my fortune to have had as much connection with the poor people of England, as with the rich; and, indeed, I have ſometimes even preferred having my lot with the former, for reaſons, which I do not think it neceſſary now to mention. Yet, without entering into particulars, I will, with the late John Hales, declare, "That in all my purſuits, truth has been my only care——————
"——————for this I have forſaken all hopes, all friends, all deſires, which might bias me, and hinder me from driving right at what I aimed. For this I have ſpent my youth, my means, all that I have."

If, through my connection with the poor, I feel a friendſhip for them, I muſt, on other accounts, feel compaſſion. My intimacy with them has led me to an acquaintance with their ſufferings. I have ſeen the rich man pay with cruel reluctance, what has been earned with ſevere labour; and inſult, when he ought to have relieved. I have ſeen the poor man, after the toil of the day, return at night to behold nothing but want and wretchedneſs in a numerous family. The poor widow, whoſe only crime has been, that ſhe has lived too long, hath had her weekly allowance ſhortened*. I have been in many poor-houſes. I have heard men plead for keeping ſlaves in the Weſt-Indies, and treating them like beaſts, by aſking, Are they not as well off as many poor people in England? I have been witneſs to the miſeries, and, in many inſtances, the oppreſſions of men confined in gaol: there are caſes, wherein the poor cannot get juſtice done them,

* I was ſome years ago employed, in company with another perſon, by a lady of great benevolence, to viſit a very aged woman in the neighbourhood of Newmarket. This extraordinary perſon (for ſuch ſhe was) aſſured me ſhe was about 130 years of age. On expreſſing my ſurpriſe that ſhe ſhould be in ſo wretched a condition as I found her in, ſhe aſſured me, that her pariſh allowance had been for many years ſhortened, becauſe ſhe had lived ſo long, as to be a burden to the pariſh. This was a remark, ſhe ſaid, of one of the overſeers.

because they cannot afford to pay for it; and poor boys and girls, sometimes, suffer death for crimes, when the laws, by which they suffer, are more criminal than they.

But if I love and pity the poor, I also respect them. I am not disposed to deal in general censure, nor to express myself in terms of personal dislike. My friendships will prevent this; nor would it, indeed, be just. Great wealth and extreme poverty are evils in governments, and the effects of public injustice. But the orders of rich and poor, within certain limits, are beneficial; mutual wants produce mutual obligations and mutual advantages. But distinctions, (I speak not here of titles or rank, this would be trifling) distinctions attached to office, should be connected with duties, and be made the badges of good citizens: these have public utility: and though riches are too often, I had liked to have said generally, the product of public plunder, of a species indeed, not always perceived by honest men, they are sometimes justly obtained, and innocently enjoyed. At the same time, were I to say, that the rich are the most valuable part of the community, I should not be true to my convictions. The prosperity and the wealth of nations depend on the poor. They dig the ore out of the mine, and the stone out of the quarry. They build our houses, work our vessels, and fight our battles: yet, while the rich enjoy almost all the benefits, the poor undergo all the labour. The rich, in many instances, have little to do, but to give orders, or to sign their names, and sometimes not even that. As to the poor, what they eat, and what they wear, their firing, candle, window-light, and small beer, are taxed, not always for good, but very frequently for evil purposes. Many are even living in the greatest profligacy, and the poor are toiling to pay for it. In short, they are the support of the English government, and, on a fair estimate, would be found to be the most valuable part of the community. But what do they meet in return? They are frequently oppressed, or at least neglected by government.

Governments are, in general, much on their guard against the poor. Princes, and courtiers, priests, men of learning, those too who only think themselves so, and poets, the flatterers of the great, talk of the *profane* and *faithless* vulgar, and every upstart is talking of a mob. I own it is prudent for certain gentlemen in England to insinuate, that the poor cannot understand the affairs of government. I say it is prudent, but it is false. The *common* people, so we call the poor, in America and in France, understand the nature of government:—Why? In those countries government is formed by the people, and made to serve their interest. This was also the case of some of the States of ancient Greece, particularly of Athens and Argos. Strange too as it

may

may appear; this was the character of almoſt all the German nations, long before they became overwhelmed by a cruel deſpotiſm; their governments were free, their armies a national militia, and each member conſidered himſelf a conſtituent part of the whole; this was even the caſe of the Spaniſh ſtates, particularly thoſe called Gothic, if we make ſome allowances for feudal cuſtoms, which left many in a ſtate of ſervitude. The Engliſh government is formed by the rich and great, and to them it is favourable, but it has been ſaid to be highly injurious to the poor. If this be true, it is not ſurpriſing that our great men ſhould ſay, the poor cannot underſtand government: the rich will take care they ſhall not underſtand it. Indeed many of our gentry and learned men are, in this reſpect, no better off, than the VULGAR and ignorant. No men underſtand the ſecrets of government but thoſe who plan them. Theſe men are enriching themſelves and their families, and leave the *common* people to toil and beggary; telling them, that they have enough to do to mind their buſineſs. It has been ſmartly obſerved of the Romiſh clergy, that they contrived to make men believe, the *laity* could not underſtand religion, but that they could: What was the conſequence? The laity were held in amazement; and the prieſts ran away with their land.

This eſſay is not intended merely for the poor. But as they will be the principal perſons in my eye, I ſhall uſe plainneſs; and endeavour to ſhew, firſt, wherein a good government conſiſts; ſecondly, ſome inſtances, wherein the Engliſh government is not good, owing to an imperfect repreſentation of the people in parliament, particularly of the poor; thirdly, ſome remarks on the bad police of this country, moſt of which would be remedied, if the poor were repreſented; and laſtly, an affectionate addreſs to the friends of Liberty.

PART. I.

On good Government.

I AM to ſhew wherein a good government conſiſts.

Government is regulation. Applied to the affairs of men living in ſociety, it conſiſts in the regulations neceſſary for men in their various intercourſes with each other, and different purſuits in life. A ſtate of ſociety without regulations would be a ſtate of diſſipation; indeed without regulations ſociety could not exiſt.

Government is alſo reſtraint. Applied to human conduct, it is the reſtraint of human actions by laws. A ſtate of ſociety, with more reſtraints than are neceſſary, is a ſtate of oppreſſion. The

more a government abounds in wiſe regulations, the leſs occaſion there will be for reſtraints. Reſtraints ſometimes even ſtop the progreſs of virtues. There are ſentiments ſo natural to man, that they even of their own accord inſpire right conduct; and regulations between man and man help them forward far better than the decrees of legiſlators. This might be exemplified in ſome part of the police of a country, no farther off than Ireland, compared with ſome part of the police in England: in ſome part of the police of this country, in the time of Alfred, compared with the preſent police: deplorable is the ſtate of that government, whoſe laws awaken crimes! and where laws, like thoſe of Draco, are written in human blood!

There are two ſenſes wherein the term good is applied. It may be conſidered without regard to any other perſon, than the Being of whom it is ſpoken. Thus we ſay, God is good; that is, he is eſſentially and neceſſarily good, and would have been ſo, if there had been no other being in the world. In another ſenſe we ſay God is good, when we conſider the works and the beings which he has formed. In like manner when we ſpeak of a good book, we mean to ſpeak of its contents; of the ſubject on which it treats, as whether it be agreeable to its profeſſed deſign, and ſuited to the perſons for whom it was intended. A good houſe is one that is pleaſant and convenient, ſuited to the circumſtances, and correſponding to the wants of the inhabitants. In like manner we ſhould ſpeak of governments. Government ſuppoſes there are laws, which alone, ſtrictly ſpeaking, ought to rule, and people who are ruled; theſe people compoſe a NATION. A government that is ſuited to a NATION, ſhould be ſo formed as to keep magiſtrates juſt, and the whole nation virtuous and happy—no other government is good.

Is a government good merely becauſe the laws are obeyed? Certainly not. In ſome countries the will of one man fixes the laws; and his will, be it ever ſo capricious, ever ſo cruel, muſt be obeyed. What is this man? A tyrant. And what are the reſt? Slaves. Thus it is in China, and in Turkey. In other countries, laws are made by a greater number, but ſmall when compared with the multitude. In either of theſe caſes the laws, I own, may provide for the happineſs of ſome individuals; but theſe individuals will, generally, be the few, that is, of thoſe who make the laws. In Poland, the nobles had more liberty (becauſe they had a ſhare in making the laws) than in moſt of the deſpotiſms of Europe: but the greater part, the peaſants, were yet left in ſlavery, notwithſtanding they were brought under the protection of the laws*. The reaſon was, they had no

* New Conſtitution of Poland, Art. 6.—This was written before the interference of the Empreſs of Ruſſia in altering the Conſtitution of Poland.

ſhare

ſhare in making the laws. The miſery uſually found in tyrannic governments proceeds from what is called the very principle of their government, though the ſource is not always known. The miſery of the poor people in France, during their monarchy, was even proverbial among travellers. Thouſands of acres of the fineſt country in the world were a kind of deſart; and where millions of poor men might have enjoyed plenty, a few rich men only indulged their pleaſures: the poor were

> ——In the midſt of nature's bleſſings curſt,
> And in a land of plenty dy'd for thirſt.
>
> ADDISON.

Theſe governments, however, would neceſſarily provide againſt ſome crimes; becauſe, where all crimes may be practiſed, government can have no ſtrength; property no ſecurity; and public happineſs is unknown. But do ſuch governments provide for public virtue? Will they encourage the poor to acquire property? Can they ſecure the felicity of a nation? To promote theſe, muſt they not work their own ruin? It may, indeed, happen, that thoſe who make the laws may, in ſome inſtances, be intereſted in promoting the happineſs of the people. Even an abſolute monarch may be a good man. He may, by his ſole will, make many laws for the public good, as did the Emperor of Germany, when Duke of Tuſcany, and the preſent Empreſs of Ruſſia. But this is accidental, and partial. All the deſpotiſms that have exiſted, from the four great deſpotiſms of the ancient world, to the preſent deſpotiſms of Europe, have been a curſe to nations.—Europe, too, is beginning to ſee the enormity. She is planting the tree of liberty in the countries where all the groſſneſs of deſpotiſm had taken deep root. Governments have even exiſted with the ſemblance of liberty,—which have yet been tyrannies: partial, oppreſſive, unjuſt: whoſe very mercy has been cruelty, and whoſe ſmiles death. Theſe governments, however, may be apparently ſtrong; the laws may be ſtrictly obeyed.

Can it be improper to obſerve, that the goodneſs of a government does not depend on ſplendor, parade, or ceremony? nor in the diſplay of pomp at home, nor in a power of doing much miſchief abroad? nor yet in vaſt ſums of money to be ſpent in offices of public ſervice? The contrary, indeed, of all this is true. Pomp and ſplendor cannot be ſupported without great expence: beſides, they lead men into errors and prejudices; and the expences muſt be drawn eventually out of the pockets of the people.—Will not this diſtreſs the poor? Will it not even do more? Will it not corrupt the rich? Will it not enfeeble go-

vernment? And what are wars?—the ſport of tyrants, but the curſe of nations: even when they lead to conqueſt, they lead to miſery.—What are pomp and ceremony in private life?—the marks of a coxcomb, rather than of a well-bred man. And what do we call the man who ſhoots a fellow-creature, to get poſſeſſion of his property?—a murderer. In like manner ſplendid governments make ſtate-coxcombs, and wars make ſtate-bullies, cut-throats for deſpots, who uſually delight in blood.

I write for plain people. A bookſeller was once aſked by a gentleman for the beſt book in his ſhop. Who would not have expected to have ſeen the 'Whole Duty of Man,' or the 'Bible,' taken down?—No; the bookſeller took down 'Tom Jones.'—"How!" exclaimed the gentleman.—"Sir," ſaid the bookſeller, "the trade think thoſe books the beſt, which fetch moſt money." I write for plain people of good ſenſe; and "a word to the wiſe," ſays poor Richard.

PART. II.—CHAP. I.

Defects in the Engliſh Government, as to Repreſentation.

The reader will pleaſe to take notice, that the preceding chapter relates to government in general. I am now to endeavour to ſhew ſome inſtances, wherein the Engliſh government is not good. Some writers have aimed to ſhew the errors of the Engliſh government, by expoſing the vices of its miniſters: and I own the vices of the great conſiderably add to the complaints of the poor. Men who diſcover little regard to principle in public departments, will ſeldom be more conſcientious in the walks of private life. Indeed there is a preſumption that the man who is not afraid of the public eye, will feel little to awe him either from religious or moral conſiderations. I remember, ſome years ago, being myſelf witneſs to a ſcene of wretchedneſs, to which no deſcription of mine could do juſtice. It was cauſed by one of our great men: the effect of one of thoſe acts of hard-hearted villany, which, by being done to obſcure individuals, paſs unnoticed.——I was walking acroſs a field in Eſſex, on a viſit to a friend, who uſed to be of the parties of a late paymaſter-general. A female figure, habited as a beggar, darted out of the hedge, with all the appearance of a fury, and flew acroſs the field.—On mentioning this to my friend, he exclaimed, "Ah! this was poor ———." The hiſtory of this unfortunate and this late paymaſter-general is well known. Similar inſtances of infamous conduct (for what I have been

been juſt alluding to entails infamy on the memory of a late pay-maſter-general) I could produce againſt a man who is one of the moſt eminent of the preſent miniſtry. But I forbear; yet is the public conduct of this criminal ſo much of a piece with his private life, that I ſcruple not to ſay, this man cannot have the intereſt of his country at heart. His attachment to government can only be an attachment to place and purſe. This man is, at preſent, at the ſervice of the miniſter. This man has alſo declared in ſo many words, to the leading man in oppoſition, that he will be at his ſervice, when he can get into power.—But I ſhall avoid, at preſent, ſpeaking of perſons, and confine myſelf to principles.

In England few poor men have any ſhare in making the laws. Some may probably think, and certain politicians aſſert, that poor men have neither the power, nor the right, to make laws. What is this, but to aſſert, that the poor man's portion in England is ſlavery. I do not ſay, that the poor people of England are ſlaves. But this I ſay, that all freemen make their own laws; and I do but ſpeak after our beſt political writers. Will gentlemen tell me, why poor men are to be ſlaves? However, while I conſider every man's right to make laws, as his moſt ſacred property, and the exerciſe of that right as eſſential to liberty, whoever cannot exerciſe that right, be he ever ſo rich, I muſt at leaſt conſider as poor: in the worſt ſenſe poor. My complaints, therefore, do not confine themſelves to paupers, commonly ſo called. Many poor men live in England, who are poſſeſſed of thouſands!

There are two ways of making laws, viz. in our own perſons, or by repreſentatives. If a country be large and populous, all the people cannot aſſemble and conſult together for the purpoſe of making laws: but if they authorize perſons, acquainted with their wants, and intereſted in their happineſs, to repreſent them, every good end may be anſwered. The only danger is, leſt theſe perſons ſhould not expreſs the public mind. Never will they expreſs it, unleſs they repreſent the public.—This is the caſe in England: the government of which it is uſual to call a limited monarchy, in reference to the perſon of the prince. But in reference to the people, ſo great a part of whom have no ſhare in repreſentation, it might be called, notwithſtanding what we ſay of the houſe of commons, a mixt ariſtocracy, as Poland has been called.

The king, the houſe of peers, and the houſe of commons, compoſe what are called the three branches of the conſtitution,—the king in his own perſon, the nobles in their own perſons. What is a houſe of commons? It is ſuppoſed to repreſent the people: but ſome ſay, it is a fiction; that is, that it does not exiſt, but that it is only ſuppoſed to exiſt. When men inquire into facts, what are called theories frequently vaniſh. We talk of a

houſe of commons, of a houſe of repreſentatives; it is the glory of Britons! and foreigners laugh at us. They aſk us, Where is this houſe? I leave others to anſwer this queſtion.

If this houſe of commons were indeed ſomething more than a fiction, I ſhould myſelf retract a little of my wonted admiration. A houſe of commons, fairly and equally repreſenting all the people of England, never did exiſt*. But if it were not a mere fiction, if it were a reality, I ſhould ſtill be obliged to yield ſomething to the following remark, viz. that a houſe of commons ſuppoſes ſome ſuperior houſe, of nobles, or ſome ſuch name. But where any order of men exiſts, of ſeparate claims and of ſeparate intereſts from the people, and whoſe ſeparate characters give them a kind of ſacred ſuperiority over the people, liberty may perhaps be endangered. It has been aſſerted, whether juſtly I do not determine, that ſuch a houſe as that of a houſe of commons exiſts in no free ſtate.

I ſhall here make a few remarks on nobility. I will repeat what an ancient writer ſays: "In no ſtate," ſays he, "are the nobles favourable to the people: equals are favourable to equals †." And elſewhere he obſerves, in every part of the earth, the government of the nobles is inconſiſtent with that of the people: and he gives his reaſons for the oppoſition of the two orders. A French writer, perhaps, had his eye on theſe paſſages, when he ſaid, the Engliſh nobility buried themſelves with Charles I. under the ruins of the throne. He adds, "they think it an honour to obey a king, but conſider it as the loweſt infamy to ſhare the power with the people ‡."

It might be eaſily ſhewn § that a patent nobility made no part of the old Engliſh government, or of the other governments of Europe. Xenophon and Monteſquieu were friends, the one to ariſtocracy, the other to monarchy, yet nobody ever more expoſed them. It is of a government, where an hereditary patent nobility is ſaid to balance the two extremes of monarchy and democracy, that Blackſtone obſerves, "It creates and preſerves that gradual ſcale of dignity, which proceeds from the beggar to the prince, riſing like a pyramid from a broad foundation, and diminiſhing to a point as it riſes. It is this aſcending and contracting proportion, that adds ſtability to any government; for when the departure is ſudden from one extreme to another, we may pronounce that ſtate to be precarious." This is beautiful, flattering alſo to national vanity, but it is theoretical. The aſcending and contract-

* Sir Henry Spelman's Gloſſary and Remains.

† Xenophon. Αθηναιων Πολιτ. c. 3. ‡ Monteſquieu's Spirit of Laws.

§ Inquiry into the Nature of Subſcription to the Thirty-nine Articles. By G. Dyer, B. A. Part III. 2d edition.

ing

ing proportion is ſeen among moſt of the American ſtates, in a houſe of repreſentatives choſen by the people, in a ſenate appointed by the repreſentatives, and in a preſident, or governor, appointed mediately or immediately by the people: yet the Americans have no nobles. The ſyſtem of ariſtocracy, they think, tends to weakneſs. It diſſolves, they ſay, the ties of families by the law of primogeniture; exhauſts the public money in places for the younger branches of noble families; keeps the orders of ſociety in a kind of dwarfiſh ſtate, by perpetuating the maxims of a barbarous age; weakens the legiſlature by advancing men to legiſlation, whoſe private regards abſorb public ſpirit, and who are irreſponſible to the nation; and, by dividing man from man, enfeebles the order of human beings*. Who can tell where the tide of contingencies will flow? France, in whoſe political fabric nobility did indeed ſeem to form the great Corinthian capital, ſaw it neceſſary to remove it, to raiſe a government of juſtice.

"I have alſo admitted that an order of nobles might exiſt without a patent nobility. I have not ſaid that it is neceſſary; or if neceſſary, that an hereditary nobility is. Its great uſe may be thought to conſiſt in forming a kind of ſenate to give bias and conſiſtency to other powers, and to produce a harmony in ſtates: a ſenate has even been thought eſſential to a republic. France, we have been told, has left out of her political fabric the pillar of ſtrength. "Never," ſays a writer, "before this time was heard of a body politic without ſuch a council †;" yet Geneva, in the infancy of the republic, was ſuch ‡: a more ſcientific writer than Mr. Burke, though he elſewhere ſays, that a king and people may exiſt without a ſenate, yet does, in fact, ſay, "there never was a good government in the world, that did not conſiſt of the three ſimple ſpecies, of monarchy, ariſtocracy, and democracy§."

"Yet France has thought otherwiſe. She thinks, that by breaking the diſtinctions between man and man, ſhe ſtrengthens ſociety, and makes the public force permanent by uniting it in a national aſſembly. I decide nothing on the truth of theſe ſentiments: I propoſe theſe queſtions:—Was it not the exiſtence of the two orders of patricians and plebeians, that promoted all the diſorders of the Roman government? Were not the ſenatus conſulta and the plebiſcita frequently little elſe than excluſive decrees for particular intereſts? And while the patricians were encroaching on the plebeians, the tribunes, called to the aid of the plebeians, became in their turn factious demagogues. Amid

* Ramſay's Hiſtory of America, Part 1. p. 71.
† Burke's Reflections on the Franch Revolution.
‡ D'Ivernois' Hiſt. of the Conſtitutions and Revolutions in Geneva.
§ Sidney on Gov. c. 2. ſ. 16.

private

private regards was not public liberty unknown? Was it not a ſenate that deſtroyed the liberties of Geneva * ?"

But to return to the Houſe of commons. Whom, or what does a houſe of commons repreſent?—not always rational beings, men and women; but for the greater part, property; and property of a particular kind. Property, though ever ſo large, copyhold, leaſehold, or perſonal, cannot be repreſented, but freehold eſtates only, poſſeſſed by men. Females, though poſſeſſed of 100,000l. a year, either in land or money, have no repreſen atives. Since the reign of Henry VI. none can be electors of knights of the ſhire, but men poſſeſſed of forty ſhillings a year. But how few poor men have freeholds! Some parithes conſiſting of ſeveral hundred perſons, perhaps, have not a ſingle freeholder. Some of the largeſt and moſt wealthy towns in England have not a ſingle repreſentative. I have not yet ſpoken of boroughs. But our theory begins to vaniſh!

If the reader can avoid ſmiling at the following facts, I ſhall think him ſimple; if he feel no indignation, I ſhall think him ſomething worſe.

The borough of Midhurſt in Suſſex, it is well known, contains not a ſingle houſe, and yet ſends two members to Parliament. The right of election is in one hundred and twenty burgage-holds; the former ſituation of which is marked out by a ſtone on each ſide.—The borough of Old Sarum, in Wiltſhire, ſends two members to parliament; yet there is but one or two houſes ſtanding. The members are choſen by a bailiff, and ſix burgeſſes, appointed by Lord Camelford, the *lord of the borough*, and entruſted by him with burgage-ſcites. The borough of Gatton and Caſtle-Riſing have each two houſes only, and two repreſentatives each.

The tenures of Midhurſt, I would obſerve, make no part of the town of Midhurſt. They were the property of the late Lord Montague, who, at the time of the election, made a temporary aſſignment of a part of them, either to ſome of his domeſtics or friends, in order to have thoſe members returned that he ſhould nominate. The truſtees of the eſtates of the preſent lord ſold theſe burgage-holds to the earl of Egremont for 40,000 guineas, whoſe brothers were returned for this borough the laſt general election.

Haſtings, in Suſſex, before the paſſing of Mr. Crewe's bill, was entirely at the diſpoſal of the treaſury. The number of voters was about twenty, all of whom had places under government, or were provided for ſome other way. This is the borough, I think,

* I am not ſpeaking here of the preſent ſtate of Geneva.—The above paragraphs, from p. 9, I quote from my Inquiry into the Nature of Subſcription.

in

in the management of which a Mr. Collins acquired a moſt ſplendid fortune, and made ample proviſion for five co-heireſſes, his daughters. The borough of Haſtings, I think, is ſtill in the *management* of government*. Theſe are what are called rotten boroughs.

I have already hinted that ſome large towns, and theſe abounding with manufactures, have not a ſingle repreſentative: and even where property is repreſented, it is not repreſented equally. The county of Middleſex, in 1693, paid 80 parts of the land tax, and in 1697, 185 of the ſubſidy, and ſent only eight members to parliament; while Cornwall paid but eight parts of the land tax, and five only of the ſubſidy, and yet ſent forty-four†. As to the rotten boroughs, of ſome of which I have juſt ſpoken, they repreſent nobody; they are private property. The perſons who are choſen for them repreſent nobody, yet they have all the power of repreſentatives: a uſe alſo they certainly have; they ſtrengthen the influence of the crown; and if a man have money enough to purchaſe a borough, and meanneſs enough to obey the beck of the miniſter, we know the reſt.—Thus it is, that perſons, who were never appointed by the people, make laws. . . . . .

The houſe of repreſentatives amounts to between five and ſix hundred members; the majority of which are appointed by voters not exceeding twelve thouſand; the nation conſiſts of ſeven or eight million: ſo that the perſons who do actually give a vote for members are, comparatively, a ſmall part of the community. The duke of Richmond, whoſe ſtatement I here nearly follow, once underſtood political calculation; and I am perſuaded, it is only what is ſuppoſed to be the danger of the experiment, that makes him fearful of the rule of practice‡. Mr. Paine obſerves §, that not above one in ſeven is repreſented; this relates to repreſentatives, actually choſen: for when all the circumſtances taken into the account are conſidered, one writer aſſerts, that the walls of St. Stephen's Chapel have not been viſited by ſix members in any parliament, elected, appointed, or delegated by their conſtituents‖; and another, that not one perſon in five thouſand is repreſented ⸸. But leaving theſe writers, I aſk again, Where is our houſe of commons? Some call it a ſtubborn ariſtocracy. Where is our houſe of repreſentatives?—Some call it a fiction. Our theory they ſay is gone. Be this as it may, the poor man is left to pay taxes.

* See Oldfield's Hiſtory of the Boroughs.
† Robinſon's Political Catechiſm.
‡ Copy of the Duke of Richmond's Letter, publiſhed by the Sheffield Society.
§ Letter to the Addreſſers.
‖ Lectures on Political Principles, by the Rev. David Williams.
⸸ Hiſtorical Eſſay on the Engliſh Conſtitution.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Conſequences of an imperfect Repreſentation, particularly to the Poor.

To the parliament, compoſed of king, lords, and commons, the buſineſs of making laws is entruſted. Now not to inſiſt, that poor men are rational beings, as well as the rich, we ſhould recollect, that as ſome laws are made for the nation at large, others relate more immediately to the poor. The militia, drawn every five years, is compoſed of them; their ſtatute-work is fixed by law; pariſh offices are alſo frequently filled by perſons of the lower orders of ſociety; and there are laws, which particularly relate to the poor, called the poor-laws. What the parliament appoints, to regulate theſe concerns, become laws; and if the men, who appoint theſe regulations, repreſented the poor and the rich equally, it is more than probable, that in making theſe laws, they would conſult alike the poor and the rich man's comfort. The whole police of this country would take a more amiable form. Great virtue is required to ſtudy the pleaſure of thoſe, to whom we are no ways indebted. Generoſity is the effect of goodneſs; but ſelf-intereſt and common prudence will teach a man to be juſt: when the goodneſs of a government muſt depend on the generoſity of individuals, that government is ſure to be defective.

The ſubjects of repreſentation are ſometimes perſons, and ſometimes property.—But in the caſe of freeholders, as one perſon may poſſeſs different freeholds in different counties, and as rich freeholders may have influence over the poor, who, perhaps, may be their tenants or dependents, ſome of the principal freeholders will uſually carry the election for a member of parliament; and theſe, again, are frequently in the intereſt of one great man. I ſhould alſo add, that none but rich men can afford to buy a borough: which, for one ſeſſion, may coſt four, or five, or perhaps, ſix thouſand pounds, and more. To be a repreſentative of a county, a perſon ſhould be poſſeſſed of 600l. a year; to be a repreſentative of a borough, a landed eſtate of 300l. a year. The conſequence is, that the tax laid on land is ſmall. The tax laid on land is ſaid to be four ſhillings in the pound. But here again we are deceived; for taking one place with another, the tax is but about one quarter of this; while the taxes laid on the neceſſaries of life are immoderately ſevere. The reaſon is plain. The rich lay on the taxes. By taxing land, they would throw the tax on themſelves. By taxing the neceſſaries of life, it is thrown on the poor*. Would not this be managed better, if

* Inquiry into the Nature of Subſcription to the 39 Articles, ſecond edition, p. 276.

the

the poor had a ſhare in making the laws? At this moment they feel the oppreſſion. Almoſt all the neceſſaries of life are dear; even bread, the ſtaff of life, is not always cheap *. There is, indeed, no place in Europe, where the neceſſaries of life are ſo dear as in England. Butchers meat, for example, has been for ſome time ſix-pence or ſeven-pence a pound; when no farther off than Dunkirk or Oſtend it would only coſt three-pence, or three-pence halfpenny. The tax on malt and malt liquors is very oppreſſive, and is of itſelf nearly equal to the land tax.

I have been ſpeaking of property, and even the neceſſaries of life; and it is certainly very hard, that poor people ſhould be pinched in every thing they eat and wear, ſo as to be incapable of ſaving a penny, and kept always poor, always dependent, till they, at length, die in a wretched workhouſe. The neceſſary expences, indeed, of government muſt be paid; and while the pride of monarchs renders armies and navies neceſſary, though in Europe, I am perſuaded, the time is almoſt over, our ſoldiers and ſailors muſt have cloathing; there muſt alſo be men of war, guardſhips, and frigates. Soldiers too ſhould not be ſent home to their families without money, and officers while employed, ſhould be ſupported with proper dignity.—In like manner, our civil magiſtrates cannot give their time and their talents to protect and defend us, without a reaſonable ſatisfaction; ſome taxes muſt therefore be raiſed. But, why do ſome of our officers receive ſuch large pay, while others are not paid enough, and many of our half-pay officers are almoſt ſtarving? Indeed, in time of peace, the whole ſyſtem of a ſtanding army is both unneceſſary and oppreſſive †. And what occaſion is there for our civil magiſtrates to receive ſuch enormous ſalaries? Out of the 17,000,000l. raiſed by taxes, one million and more goes to defray the expences of a ſingle man, and ſome of the neceſſary expences of government. But who knows how the reſt is expended?

How are the poor oppreſſed, to enrich our nobles!—The duke of Newcaſtle, under the name of auditor of the exchequer, receives, in the time of war, twenty-eight or thirty thouſand a year ‡. The two ſecretaries of ſtate, nine thouſand a year each.

* According to Sir John Sinclair, of the many millions raiſed in this country, only about two millions and a half are impoſed on property, whereas thirteen millions are levied upon conſumption. Hiſt. of the Revenue, vol. ii. p. 3, c. 1. In Queen Anne's reign, two attempts were made to introduce a tax on incomes, and perquiſites of office; but they both miſcarried; and a tax on certain grants from the crown was over-ruled. The leading men, ſays Sir John Sinclair, in both houſes, being too deeply intereſted in grants of that nature to ſuffer ſuch a bill to paſs into a law.

All the week's wages of a day-labourer are frequently conſumed in one ſingle article, flour.

† Inquiry into the Nature of Subſcription. Second edition, p. 277.

‡ For writing his name on blank ſheets of paper!

The

The duke of Richmond, beſides the twenty or twenty four thouſand which he receives from the coals brought into the river, receives five thouſand a year as maſter of the ordnance: The net ſalary of the lord chancellor is, perhaps, not too large in proportion. Though even on a moderate calculation, when perquiſites and fees received by him from thoſe whom he puts into different offices are conſidered, he cannot receive leſs than twenty thouſand, though moſt probably it is conſiderably more. The lord chief juſtice of the court of king's bench, beſides his ample ſalary, hath alſo large perquiſites ariſing from offices; and from one only, the office of marſhal of the court of king's bench, who was put in by him, he receives, I am told, a very conſiderable ſum*. There is no country in Europe, according to a great writer, where the art of money-catching has been ſo dexterouſly managed by government, and where the art of waſting it has been ſo prodigal as in England†. To compare it with the government in America, where the principal magiſtrate receives only five thouſand pounds a year ‡, for every penny of which he accounts, I am informed, to congreſs; who loves all the ſtates, and who is beloved by them all; who looks out of his window, ſurveys his plantations, and is ſupported principally by his own eſtates, and where the firſt judge receives only nine hundred pounds a year, is like comparing a dwarf to a giant.

Great part of the taxes laid on the people, are not employed merely in great ſalaries to magiſtrates and officers in public ſervice, but are waſted on placemen and penſioners. Perhaps, too, it may not be improper to obſerve, that penſions and ſinecure places are held, not only by men who move directly with the miniſter, but even by thoſe, who are in oppoſition, and are called patriots, ſome of whom I would willingly believe are truly ſo. It is, however, frequently difficult to aſcertain theſe; becauſe they may be held under different names;—becauſe they may be ſold: ſo that a good man may ſtand up very conſcientiouſly, and ſay, "I *do* hold no place under government."

That Mr. Pitt in addition to his ſalary, which is at leaſt, I am informed, between nine and ten thouſand a year, beſides other things connected with it, as firſt lord of the treaſury, and chancellor of the exchequer; that Mr. Pitt, I ſay, ſhould have condeſcended to receive a ſinecure place of between three and four thouſand a year, at leaſt, is reckoned a trifle for a prime miniſter.

* While I am on this ſubject, I am reminded of a droll anecdote that I have heard. When a queſtion relative to fees of office was diſcuſſing in Weſtminſter-Hall, Lord Mansfield made the declaration in open court, "Pleaſe to obſerve, I "have nothing to do with the tap."

† See Sir John Sinclair's Hiſtory of the Revenue.

‡ It ſhould, however, be acknowledged, that five thouſand a year in America is worth at leaſt ten thouſand in England.

I will

I will mention one or two more examples.

Lord Stormont receives ſix thouſand a year in ſinecures. The lord chief juſtice in Eyre, Lord Sidney, receives two thouſand a year; a mere ſinecure: and it is well known, that in our law-courts, cuſtoms, exciſe, and war-office, there are numerous offices, poſſeſſed by dukes and earls, their ſons, and dependents on the court, who receive vaſt ſalaries *for doing nothing*. The duke of Grafton receives a conſiderable ſalary as receiver general of the profits of the ſeals in the king's bench, and the common pleas, *for doing nothing*. The writs iſſued from thoſe courts have a black ſtamp on them, which, I ſuppoſe, will be allowed to have no very great meaning. The duke of St. Alban's, and ſeveral other noble lords and gentlemen, have alſo conſiderable ſalaries out of the law-courts *for doing nothing*; for all the buſineſs is done by clerks, while the gentlemen are amuſing themſelves at their country ſeats. In ſome inſtances, indeed, the buſineſs is of ſuch a nature, that none but the clerks could do it. Lords and gentlemen know nothing about it; which made one of the clerks humourouſly ſay in my hearing, "Thank heaven, if all "the places in our court are taken away, mine never will; for "I only know any thing about the buſineſs."

Theſe places are ſo truly ridiculous, and amid the preſent diſtreſſes of the poor, and the light that was breaking in upon the nation, began to appear ſo enormous, that I am informed a perſon going to pay for another, the tax laid on a certain great office, made the following obſervation, when he was going to make his laſt payment: "I am going, for the laſt time, to pay this tax;" intimating thereby, that ſuch evils could not continue another year. He will, however, I fear, not prove a true prophet.

As to the vaſt ſum received by the duke of Richmond from the tax on coals, it muſt ſtrike every one who ſeriouſly reflects, and particularly ſince Mr. Paine's pamphlet has been made the ſubject of converſation. Were it not for this tax, and another ridiculous one, which ſtill continues, after the reaſon for laying it on is no more, coals would be cheaper in London than in the country. At Cambridge, for example, coals are brought into the river by gangs, drawn by ſeveral horſes, and attended by boys and men from Lynn, in Norfolk, about fifty miles from Cambridge. Where lighters, without the expence of horſes, bring the coals into the docks from the colliers, at the diſtance of only two or three miles down the river, or from Newcaſtle traders, which lie cloſe to London bridge, coals ſhould be cheaper. This ſevere tax on coals is the more oppreſſive on the poor people in London, as the coals that come into the pool, pay an immediate tax to government.—While I was writing this paragraph, coals, I was informed,

formed, were thirty ſhillings a chaldron at Cambridge, and about three weeks afterwards were forty-eight ſhillings in London *.

Property is juſtly reckoned ſacred: and a perſon who ſhould aſcribe ſome of the oppreſſions of the poor to the eſtates of the rich, would probably be reckoned ſacrilegious. Though I admit, that the large eſtates of our nobles have, in many inſtances, been accumulated by no guilt of theirs, yet, in their origin, they may be traced to contributions on the public, to enormous ſalaries and grants from princes, and are ſo far *public grievances:* and in a country where one man poſſeſſes three or four magnificent houſes, and ſixty or eighty thouſand a year, or perhaps more, while many of the induſtrious poor can ſcarcely get the neceſſaries of life; in ſuch a country, I ſay, the government muſt be defective †.

As to places and penſions, they are paid, directly or indirectly, out of a tax levied on the people, and in a way that principally affects the poor. But the evil does not reſt here. They corrupt the principles and morals of thoſe who receive them. Hence miſtreſſes; the ruining of young country girls; the adventuring at faro-tables, and all manner of profligacy. Hence the additional ſupport to the pride of rank, that ſupercilious inſolence, that leads thoſe who are born noble, and others, who are mere upſtarts, to treat the poor man with contempt.

CHAP. III.

On the Ignorance of the Poor, and the Imperfection of the Laws.

When a man is conſcious that he is juſt to his neighbours, he is not apt to ſuſpect them of evil intentions againſt himſelf. I knew a country 'ſquire, very kind to his tenants, who uſed frequently to ſay to an old gripus of a baronet, perpetually pinching and curſing his poor neighbours, "Thank God, all my tenants are honeſt men." Thus in governments: mercy and juſtice have attracting charms, and an enlivening influence; communicating like the ſun, a portion of heat on thoſe who behold them. The only way of eſtabliſhing juſtice in the world, is, to make juſt laws: and juſt laws will be the effect only of political equality. In no government can ſtrict juſtice be adminiſtered, where the laws are not made by the people. It is even the intereſt of mankind to obey juſt laws: and where governments ſpare the property of the poor, property is moſt ſecure. Injuſtice, ine-

* I ſpeak thus merely becauſe coals, in the courſe of three or four weeks, roſe ſeveral ſhillings in the chaldron.

† I am ſpeaking of the fortunes procured from *public money*.

quality, oppreſſion, make the rich tyrannical and ſuſpicious, and the poor artful and thieviſh. Many crimes, crimes, too, for which men ſuffer death in England, are the effects either of exceſs, or of defect in the laws: private crimes flow from public injuſtice.

Injuſtice is always ſuſpicious: and it ſhould ſeem as if the governments of Europe were conſcious of being oppreſſive, by the ignorance in which the poor are kept. In London, I know, moſt pariſhes have charity ſchools, where poor children are taught to read and write. So far as theſe ſchools afford uſeful learning to the poor, they poſſeſs excellencies.

Yet, without diminiſhing from the praiſe that is due to theſe inſtitutions, I venture to ſay they are all defective: I except none.—In fact, they are not public ſchools. Children are not taken out of the world, nor trained for the world. The children of catholics and diſſenters are not provided for in theſe inſtitutions; —— children are taken out of a party; taught to ſerve a party; and the education is ſlaviſh and ſuperſtitious. This remark applies not only to what are called charity ſchools, but to all royal and public foundations.

But even admitting the excellencies of theſe charity ſchools, yet they are by no means general. If we go into the country, we ſhall find many towns without charity ſchools. And in many villages, I may ſay, in moſt, there is no *free* proviſion for inſtructing poor children; and to ſay, that the poor have no time through their wants for the improvement of their minds? is to utter the greateſt poſſible reproach againſt the preſent ſtate of civil ſociety. ——I once knew a poor man, who had a ſickly wife, and nine children. He could only earn a ſhilling a day, by working on the public roads; and his family lived on bread and water, with a little ſalt thrown into the water to give it a reliſh. Yet the honeſt man uſed to ſay, "Ned ſhall have a little learning, and Ned "ſhall teach Bet, and Bet Suſan, and ſo on;" and he was willing to ſtint himſelf of bread, to pay fourpence a week to a country dame, to have his poor boy taught to read. I mention this, not as a ſingular example: but it is a great diſgrace to any government, that one ſuch example ſhould be found. To make theſe inſtitutions public, they ſhould be in ſome manner regulated by government; acceſſible to every poor child in a pariſh or diſtrict. The free ſtates of Greece and Rome, and even a deſpotic government of the Eaſt, I mean Perſia, might give England ſome uſeful inſtruction on this head. To prevent education from being confined to a party, children ſhould be left to their parents in what relates to religion: and in order to train them for the world, they ſhould be inſtructed in ſuch learning, as may be pro-

per for their reſpective ſituations, without any regard to a particular party.

The line of ſeparation between rich and poor children is drawn too wide in England. I know I am hazarding a bold opinion: I venture, however, to maintain, that the true policy of nations is to have the children of rich and poor taught, though not the ſame kind of learning, yet in the ſame ſchool. In ſome country free ſchools, this, I know, is ſometimes the caſe; yet is it on ſuch principles, as do not entirely fall in with my idea.

Such policy would humanize the heart, and prevent that proneneſs to inſolence, which too often accompanies the wealthy, and that proneneſs to ſervility, which attends the poor. The principle which equalizes man, dignifies and exalts him. A nobler inſtitution does not exiſt, in theory, than Chriſt-Hoſpital, in London: here children are taught reading, writing, arithmetic, drawing, mathematics, and navigation; the latin, greek, and hebrew languages. If ſchools were eſtabliſhed in England on theſe principles; and if children were taught ſuch branches of learning as their reſpective ſituations and ranks required; and if proviſion were made for the ſuperior talents of even the poor, valuable conſequences would follow. Theſe would be *public* ſchools. Some of the beſt governments of antiquity had ſome generous proviſions on this head, and, I flatter myſelf, the government of France will have better ſtill. Perhaps it would be difficult to conceive a better plan than that adopted by the american ſtates through their townſhips, counties, and univerſities. Eton ſchool, Weſtminſter ſchool, Wincheſter ſchool, the Charter-houſe, Merchant Taylors, and St. Paul's, are none of them public ſchools in the proper ſenſe of the word; nor are charity ſchools; nor yet Chriſt's Hoſpital. They are all eſtabliſhed in conformity to the principle of the Engliſh government, which is too partial and ariſtocratical.

In the chapter on the poor-rates, I have obſerved that the private exertions of humane individuals, would perhaps, reach every caſe of diſtreſs, though no public charities exiſted. A reply ſimilar to this has been made in oppoſition to a plan for national education. It has been urged too, that the tutors who inſtruct in the more public inſtitutions, are almoſt left in a ſtate of irreſponſibility, and, therefore, too often ſink into negligence and ſecurity. But public inſtruction ſhould be ſubject to public inſpection; and if a wiſe ſcheme was purſued in the choice and arrangement of viſitors, this negligence would naturally ſubſide: nor need the difficulty of filling ſuch a department be urged: for national education would, for the moſt part, relate only to common learning: common talents, therefore, accompanied with in-

tegrity, would, in general, be ſufficient requiſites for a public inſpector.

That private individuals will feel an attention to the intereſts of thoſe parties and ſects to which they belong, and to thoſe ſchools, to the ſupport of which they immediately contribute, I admit. But national inſtitutions need not ſuperſede private, though they would certainly render them leſs neceſſary. But herein private inſtitutions are wont to be defective; they do not neceſſarily reach the caſes of all; there are thouſands of poor children in this country, who have no education. A ſcheme for public inſtruction would go to furniſh the poor with knowledge ſufficient for them, at leaſt, to get their living, to make them honeſt men, citizens, and patriots. A ſtate ſhould ſtop there.

In theſe ſchools of public inſtruction, proviſion might be made for a knowledge of the laws. Laws ſhould be ſimple, intelligible, and, at proper intervals, be read publicly.

I am going to complain of a particular kind of ignorance, in which poor people are kept; I mean an ignorance of the laws.

Anciently, it was the cuſtom in this country to write the laws in the old norman french. The names of writs, till lately, were all in latin. Acts of parliament are, at preſent, written in the old german character; and many a poor man who may be able, perhaps, to read his bible, would be unable to ſpell an act of parliament, even if it was placed before him. Nor is this all: as I am not able to ſpeak in my own words ſo well, I will here borrow the words of an excellent writer:

" In England, the people at large are as perfectly ignorant of the acts of parliament, after they are made, as they poſſibly can be before. They are printed by one man only, who is called the king's printer,—in the old german character, which few men can read,—and ſold at a price, which few can afford to pay. But, leſt ſome ſcraps or comments upon them ſhould come to the people through the medium of public newſpapers, every ſuch paper is ſtamped with a heavy duty; and an act of parliament is made, to prevent men from letting their papers to each other *; ſo that not one perſon in a hundred ſees a newſpaper once in a year. If a man, at the bottom of Yorkſhire, diſcovers by inſtinct that a law is made, which is intereſting for him to know, he has only to make a journey to London, find out the king's printer, pay a

* " As this work may chance to fall into the hands of ſome people who never ſee the acts of parliament, (the ſame precautions not being taken to prevent its circulation) it is out of compaſſion to that claſs of readers, that I give this information. It is a duty of humanity, to ſave our fellow-creatures from falling into ſnares, even thoſe that are ſpread for them by the government: Therefore, Notice is hereby given to all perſons, to whom theſe preſents ſhall come, that the penalty for letting a newſpaper, within the kingdom of Great Britain, is fifty pounds."

penny a page for the law, and learn the german alphabet. He is then prepared to ſpell out his duty *."

Now it cannot be ſaid that the laws of England are ſo juſt, ſo agreeable to the conſciences of mankind, ſo like the ten commandments, that a poor man muſt know he is doing wrong, without knowing the act of parliament, that makes any particular action a crime, and annexes to it a puniſhment. The feelings and the wants of man have a clear and diſtinct voice; and if laws do not ſpeak as diſtinctly, and with the ſame kind of natural tone, poor men will not underſtand them; or if they underſtand them, they will not be always forward to obey them. Their feelings and their wants will have the firſt hearing, and the laws will not be heard, till they are denounced from a tribunal of juſtice. If theſe laws be not clear, I mean, to the reaſon and conſcience of mankind, the greater is the reaſon for their being direct and explicit. But, does reaſon, does conſcience, do the ten commandments, tell man, that the birds which fly in the open air, or, perhaps, perch in the poor man's garden; or that the fiſhes, which ſwim in the public river, or, perhaps, by the poor man's cottage, are the property of the rich; and that a poor man, who ſhoots a bird, or catches a fiſh, is doing wrong? Yet, before a man has a right to ſhoot a ſingle bird, he muſt take out a licence, which will coſt him three guineas, and muſt poſſeſs 100l. a year, either leaſehold or freehold, or be liable to pay twenty pounds, and in ſome caſes fifty.

The game laws, in their origin, were extremely tyrannical: though I own, that now, while a licence is paid for by thoſe, who are ſuppoſed to be qualified, the tax affects perſons of property, and not the poor. But I ſtill think them oppreſſive.

A poacher, for aught I know, may be as honeſt a man as the lord of the manor, or as any man, who poſſeſſes the right of fiſhery. But the lord of the manor may catch as many fiſhes as he pleaſes, and in what manner he pleaſes, while the poor man, who poſſeſſes not the right of fiſhery, may be tranſported for the ſame action.

It is an excellent maxim of the engliſh law (many of its maxims are excellent, and many of its laws are bad) that all poſitive laws, which are contrary to the laws of nature and of reaſon, are no laws at all: and hence it is (Coke on Litt. 110.) that if a town hath cuſtoms, which are againſt law and reaſon, and theſe cuſtoms are confirmed by act of parliament, ſuch confirmation ſhall not make them to be good and binding.

The air and the water, and the creatures that live in them, are the common gifts of providence: and till a man has, by his

* Barlow's Advice to Privileged Orders.

own

own induſtry, acquired ſome right in what nature has left common, they are as much one man's as another's *. How far ſociety has a right to appropriate what nature has left common, I ſhall not ſtop to inquire.—But God has never ſaid, The 'ſquire may ſhoot a partridge or a pheaſant, though the labourer ſhall not; or that Sir Robert may draw the fiſh out of the river, and that his poor tenant ſhall be impriſoned for the ſame action.

I do but juſt mention theſe among the many laws, that oppreſs the poor: and not to inſiſt, that theſe are unjuſt, which, however, they certainly are, I affirm in general, that the more injuſtice there is in the laws, the greater is the neceſſity for their being known, that a poor man may not be caught in a trap by his ignorance.

Conſidering the preſent complicate ſyſtem of our laws, and the vaſt number of cauſes (the conſequence of ſuch a ſyſtem) tried in our courts of law, frequent circumlocutions, and the uſe of many technical expreſſions, are uſeful for the profeſſion, and cannot be avoided: but this is only admitting, that the ſmaller evil is tolerable, that qualifies the greater. The greater evil ſhould be removed.

I know it will be ſaid, that poor men need not be ſo ignorant of theſe laws, as I ſeem to intimate: and I acknowledge, that as the 'ſquire and lord of the manor are taught by our laws to conſider the birds and the fiſh as their property, they are likely to let the poor man know who is maſter; and as they have time and money to procure the acts of parliament, and ſee occaſion, may have them written out plain, and get them paſted up in the village.—This, however, is accidental; it may or it may not happen. But in a thouſand inſtances, in which the intereſt of the poor is concerned, it is literally true, that a poor man has neither time nor money to know what our laws have made his duty, nor to aſcertain his juſt rights. In this country, the conſumption of time and money neceſſary to know what is law, is more than poor men can afford to loſe; and after all, perhaps, they may get enſnared; for if they ſhould be able to ſpell out an act of parliament, they may probably get tricked by ſome dirty lawyer, if not directly to get money, in compliance at leaſt with the wiſhes of ſome *great* perſon, and through fear of doing juſtice to a poor man.

Several poor men are now lingering in priſon, when the men, who have thrown them in, are the criminals. But ignorance was the lot of the poor man, and their proſecutors and lawyers were *knowing*, but bad men.

* Locke on Government.

CHAP. IV.

Diſproportion between Crimes and Puniſhments.

NEXT to what I have already obſerved, I complain of the GREAT DISPROPORTION between crimes and puniſhments. This is the evil ſo well marked out by the moſt humane of writers *; an evil which particularly affects the poor. Another eminent writer † obſerves, That every puniſhment, which does not proceed from abſolute neceſſity, is tyrannical. I will add, that a puniſhment, which is ſeverer than any crime requires, tends to promote the commiſſion of greater crimes, and, therefore, is not only uſeleſs, but pernicious.

A perſon, who undertakes to look into this ſubject, need not poſſeſs over-much ſenſibility to feel indignation. His heart need only poſſeſs the common ſympathies of humanity; let him only not be a monſter.

I ſay nothing of thoſe penal ſtatutes, which treat ſome virtues as vices, and religious opinions as crimes; ſtatutes, which the legiſlature has neither ſufficient courage to enforce, nor ſufficient wiſdom to repeal. As to certain proclamations, which charge ſedition on the ſpirit of liberty, them I paſs by. They ſhew, indeed, that there are oppreſſions in government, from which our great men derive profits, and into which they wiſh not the people to ſcrutinize;—though the people of England ſhould be taught, that ſuch proclamations are not laws;—I ſpeak here of real crimes, magnified by the laws.

What are called fines ‡ and petty offences, partake ſometimes of the puniſhment of felonies; at leaſt, ſome who have been guilty only of miſdemeanors, are in ſome gaols confined with felons. The conſequence of this is very ſerious. Poor lads, who ſhould have been corrected only by being obliged to labour, are thrown over to idleneſs; and young practitioners in vice are made the companions and imitators of hardened criminals. A writer, who gave much attention to the miſery of priſoners, and who died in their ſervice, obſerves, "That petty offenders, who are committed to Bridewell for a year or two, and ſpend that time, not in hard labour, but in idleneſs and wicked company, or are ſent for that time to county gaols, generally grow deſperate, and

* Marquis of Beccaria on Crimes and Puniſhments.

† Baron Monteſquieu's Spirit of Laws.

‡ "By fines are underſtood ſuch as are detained till they pay a ſum of money; ſuch as are obliged to find ſecurity for good behaviour; and ſuch as are committed for a limited term to mere confinement, or, which is much the ſame, to hard labour: by petty offences, ſuch as are ſent to gaols inſtead of bridewells."—HOWARD.

come

come out fitted for the perpetration of any villany. Half the robberies committed in and about London are planned in the prisons by that dreadful assemblage of criminals." The same humane writer observes elsewhere, "That he has frequently seen culprits, of twelve and fourteen years of age, listening with eagerness to the adventures, stratagems, and escapes of the most daring felons." Perhaps, poor children, their misfortune was, that they were never taught better, or that they had no trade. And, What was their punishment? They were sent to seminaries of vice; they were instructed in a knowledge, which led them to the gallows. Their proper place was only a house of correction, or a house of industry.—Oh! England, Where is justice? Where is mercy?

What are called petit larcenies, are frequently punished with transportation; and to return from transportation, is felony without clergy, that is, death for the first offence. Were I to go into all the minutiæ of these crimes, and to weigh, in a just balance, their proportion of punishment*, I should certainly feel horror. But no case is more deserving of attention, than that of prisoners confined for debt.

It was an excellent provision in the saxon laws, that no one could be confined for debt. "Debts were recovered by receiving their value in goods, or money; and then, if payment was not made, the defendant's arms were seized, and he himself was thrown on his friends for support†." Our present laws are injurious both to debtor and creditor, and are directly the reverse of the laws, which relate to bankrupts, who are a kind of debtors. If bankrupts deliver up their effects, they cannot be imprisoned, if they get their certificates signed. Indeed, it is no uncommon case for debtors to be living in prison in a kind of state‡, on the property of their creditors, and for the creditors to be impoverished, and left to curse the defect in the administration of justice; while many a poor creature has, perhaps, had all his goods sold, or, perhaps he had none to sell, and he has been sent to rot in a gaol for three or four pounds. Persons are frequently detained in prison merely for fees, that are necessary for their discharge.

I am not, indeed, ignorant, that many debtors are villains, very

* See an Abstract of the Penal Statutes, by Capel Loft, Esq.

† Mirrour of Justices. Inquiry into the Nature of Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles.

‡ I knew a person, who had once lived in great affluence, but became a bankrupt: this person, however, having still a good deal of money to play with, and being able to satisfy cunning lawyers, lived in Newgate in great style. In Ireland there is a prisoner, confined for debt, who is possessed of a very large fortune; since his confinement, he offered himself, I am informed, a candidate for a seat in parliament, if I recollect right, for the county of Lowth. So many interesting facts have lately been stated by the committee employed to look into the case of debtors, that I forbear to mention many particulars, which I had collected myself.

injurious to their creditors, and that they would prefer going to a gaol to doing juſtice *. But then, I maintain, that a wiſe legiſlature might make proviſion againſt theſe evils more efficacious, and far better proportioned to the crimes, than any which now exiſt. If debtors were obliged to give up their effects, till their debt was paid, or obliged to work, the creditor might be paid. Who, at leaſt, can doubt, whether the creditor would not have greater ſecurity? This, if I recollect right, is the caſe at the raſp-houſe at Amſterdam, and throughout Holland there are very few debtors, indeed, very few priſoners.

"Even in Turkey," ſays Dr. Shaw †, "in a caſe of debt the debtor is uſually detained in priſon, till the chouries have ſeized upon his effects. If the ſale amounts to more than his debt, the overplus is returned to the priſoner; if ſhort, he is releaſed, and no future demands are to be made." The Lord Chancellor was therefore too haſty, in ſaying lately in the houſe of lords, (Tueſday, June 16, 1793) that "in all laws of all civilized countries, where a debtor was unable to pay, the creditor had certain power to exerciſe ſeverity over him."

The caſe of confinement too is frequently attended with circumſtances highly injurious. In Newgate, debtors and felons are kept diſtinct; but in many priſons felons and debtors have a common priſon: and, indeed, the latter are ſometimes worſe off than the former: "for in many county gaols," ſays Howard, "debtors have no bread; although it is granted to the highwayman, the houſebreaker, and the murderer; and medical aſſiſtance, which is provided for the latter, is frequently withholden from the former. I have often (continues he) ſeen theſe priſoners eating their water-ſoup (bread boiled in mere water) and heard them ſay, 'We are 'locked up, and almoſt ſtarved to death:' and debtors, who would work, have not been permitted to have any tools, leſt they ſhould furniſh felons with them for eſcape, or other miſchief." Hard, indeed, is the caſe of debtors confined for exchequer proceſſes, and from eccleſiaſtical courts! The latter cannot have the privilege of bail, and the former are generally deprived of the benefit of the inſolvent act.

The expence attending the recovery of ſmall debts has frequently been the ſubject of complaint.—I have alſo been ſeriouſly affected in obſerving the great diſproportion between priſon and

* In a priſon in London, that I have viſited, I met with a man, who had been confined ten years for about three pounds. On my inquiring after the ſmalleſt debtor, the keeper called him, ſaying, at the ſame time, "George does not wiſh to be enlarged." The man, apprehenſive that I wanted to diſcharge his debt, ſaid, "If one farthing would pay it, I will not agree to a diſcharge." He morever informed me, that more than one perſon had actually offered to pay the debt: but he refuſed the offer.

† Shaw's Travels, 250. 2d. edit.

priſon,

priſon, and debtor and debtor; at the idleneſs and profligacy which exiſt in priſons; and at the grievous oppreſſions of confining poor people in gaol for two or three pounds.

In the maſter debtor's ſide in the Marſhalſea, for example, two men occupy one dreadful place to ſleep in, (which I have viſited) for 2s. 4d. a week; and Mr. Howard mentions ſome that paid conſiderably more. In the King's Bench, where accommodations are, comparatively, even agreeable, two men pay only each a ſhilling a week for a room. I am, however, not ignorant, that priſoners, in the King's Bench and Fleet, let out their rooms for an enormous benefit. In the Marſhalſea, perſons may be confined for very ſmall debts, a few ſhillings; in the King's Bench and Fleet for hundreds, and ſome for thouſands.—Even ſtate-priſoners, at the King's Bench, only pay 2s. 6d. a week for their rooms. Puniſhment ſhould be adjuſted according to the rule laid down by Beccaria, Monteſquieu, and ſince by the very ingenious Mr. David Williams *, in a work well deſerving the ſtudy of the Britiſh youth, viz. in proportion to the injury done to ſociety. The œconomy of priſons ſhould be regulated on the ſame principle.

On going into the debtors' court of the county gaol in the borough, and in the Marſhalſea, I was not a little affected on ſeeing forty hearty men, for in each priſon there were, I think, about that number, doing nothing but ſauntering backwards and forwards, or ſmoaking, and drinking porter. The impreſſion made on me by the following circumſtances, I ſhall never forget:—When I was in the court of the Marſhalſea priſon, a poor man was carried out to be buried, followed by his wife and three children. The debtors told me, his caſe was this: He had been in but three days, and was in a dying ſtate, when admitted. The poor man was very earneſt to be ſuffered to die at home: and the priſoners drew up a petition to the creditor, and raiſed a ſubſcription. They ſhewed me the ſubſcription-liſt. They could not raiſe the ſum, though it was only three pounds and odd: the creditor exclaimed, "Let him die, and be damned!"

"Crimes," ſays the merciful Beccaria, "ſhould be eſtimated by the injury done to ſociety.—This (continues he) is one of thoſe palpable truths, which, though evident to the meaneſt capacity, yet, by a combination of circumſtances, is only known to a few thinking men in every nation." England is chargeable with the ſame errors in this reſpect, as the other governments of Europe.

There is no truth, of which I am more convinced, than, that there is a moſt unjuſt eſtimate of the different ſorts of felonies;

* Lectures on Political Principles.

that ſome of thoſe called felonies within clergy, which are not puniſhed with death for the firſt offence, ought only to be called miſdemeanors or fines; and many of theſe called felonies without clergy, which are death for the firſt offence, are alſo moſt unjuſtly rated. Why ſtealing one hawk (37 E. III. c. 19) or fiſhing in another man's pond, with intent to ſteal, (31 H. VIII. c. 2) ſhould be treated as felonies, when other crimes, more injurious to ſociety, are not, I am at a loſs to determine *.

I ſay nothing, at preſent, of thoſe crimes, which are puniſhed with death, of which more hereafter. But the tranſportation of convicts, in certain caſes, appears to me impolitic and cruel. Men, who have injured ſociety by their crimes, might, in ſome meaſure, repair the injuries by their labours, by being employed in manufactories at home; by being obliged to experience ſome hours of ſolitary confinement by day †, they might be brought to reflection; and by labouring near the place of their birth, or where they committed the crime, they might at the ſame time afford a ſtanding example to others which could not fail to inſtruct.

I ſpeak here againſt tranſportation only in certain caſes; for I acknowledge, where a crime has magnitude, or where a criminal, by his former courſe of life, has loſt all character and all confidence, tranſportation may be even a merciful proviſion; by giving a poor fellow the means of recovering his character, and of getting employment in a place where he is not known. Theſe reaſons, however, ſhould not be too generally admitted.

The frequency of puniſhment is another evil, by reaſon of which this nation ſighs. If crimes produce puniſhments, ſure I am, that puniſhments frequently produce crimes. The cruelty and injuſtice of the laws are frequently the reaſons, why the laws are not executed. The mercy, and even the good effects of puniſhment, depend on its being juſt, certain, and expeditious.

The loading of priſoners with irons is a cuſtom, which Mr. Howard, with great propriety, condemns. As to the ſecurity of priſoners, this might be more effectually obtained, by increaſing the number of turnkeys in proportion to the number of priſoners, and by having priſons ſo conſtructed, as to make inſpection more neceſſary, and eſcapes almoſt impoſſible.

* See an Abſtract of the Penal Statutes, by Capel Loft, Eſq.

† Solitary confinement, without any intermediate hours for work and company, is too ſevere, to a mind not accuſtomed to reflect intolerable. Silence and ſolitude frequently terminate either in madneſs or in ſuicide. This was very frequently the caſe in the monaſtery of la Trappe in lower Normandy, where perpetual ſilence was enjoined, as a gentleman who was there for three days aſſured me. Solitary confinement has, I hear, been practiſed with great ſucceſs in ſome priſons lately. A gentleman of Norwich, I am informed, uſed every kind of diſcipline on a profligate youth, without ſucceſs. He at length made trial of ſolitude. "I can bear any thing but this," exclaimed the youth.—It worked his reformation.

The plans propoſed by Mr. Howard and Dr. Jebb were humane and judicious; but, in my opinion, Dr. Jebb's* was the beſt. Either of theſe plans is full of mercy and ſecurity; and, I will add, falls in with a ſyſtem of far leſs expence, than that which at preſent prevails. I cannot forbear obſerving, that loading priſoners with irons is not ſtrictly agreeable to the humanity of ſome of the laws of England, by which gaolers are forbidden to put their priſoners to pain or torture.

Where a perſon is not greatly depraved, I can eaſily conceive, that irons muſt be galling to ſomething, that is more ſuſceptible than the leg. Galling they are to the latter in a high degree; for the double irons are ſometimes painful to priſoners in walking, or lying down: and to perſons highly depraved, I am convinced, that irons are frequently conſidered as a kind of bracelet, or badge of honour, diſtinguiſhing them from common culprits†.—There is an abominable practice known to exiſt in ſome priſons, viz. for the gaoler to make fees by giving priſoners the choice of irons.

The idea, which I could wiſh to ſee entertained of a priſon, is that of a *bettering houſe*. But can this be the caſe, where priſoners are ſuffered to be totally unemployed? That idleneſs is the parent of all vice, is a maxim taught by univerſal experience. Leaving priſoners, therefore, to paſs their time without employment, is to make puniſhment, that ought to be the means of preventing crimes, the means of increaſing them. It is alſo to make priſoners a burden to the public, who have already been its bane. Bridewells, I think, are, in general, work-houſes: and why ſhould not other priſons be ſo too? In Oxford, Ipſwich, and Norwich gaols, I underſtand, the priſoners have, of late years, been kept employed, with great advantage to the place and to themſelves: and too much praiſe cannot be paid to the very humane Mr. Charles Pitt, member for Dorcheſter, for the great improvement which he has been the means of introducing in this reſpect, into Dorcheſter gaol.

The employment of convicts alſo, after their ſentence is expired, is a matter of very ſerious concern. This ſubject is, I think, to be brought forward in the houſe of commons, the next ſeſſion of parliament, by Sir Charles Bunbury, and it ought to be thoroughly diſcuſſed. The reaſon why ſo many return to their old practices, after the expiration of their ſentence, is want of employment. Who will employ us? What muſt we do? Muſt

* Jebb's Works, vol. ii. I allude particularly to what Dr. J. ſays relative to walls.

† I remember once obſerving a convict in converſation with a perſon, whoſe appearance beſpoke him to be a comrade. He frequently pointed to his irons with a kind of triumph. I ſuppoſed his meaning to be, that he thought them no diſgrace; or that, though his comrade had not hitherto arrived at this diſtinction, yet, if he perſevered, he might attain it.

we ſtarve? Theſe are affecting queſtions. Houſes of Induſtry, properly conſtructed, and properly regulated, with a view to find employment to ſuch men, are great deſideratums in England.

CHAP. V.

Of Capital Puniſhments.

CAN I here help ſtopping to ſigh over the miſeries of mankind, and to expreſs my horror at the tyranny of human laws?—I am going to ſpeak of capital puniſhments.

"It is evident," ſays Voltaire, "that a ſcore of ſtout robbers, condemned for life to ſome public work, would ſerve the ſtate in their puniſhment; and that hanging them is a benefit to nobody, but the executioner." Puniſhing theſe men, then, with death, is uſeleſs and impolitic: it is more; it is cruel and unjuſt;—cruel, to deprive a poor creature of his exiſtence; unjuſt, becauſe there is no proportion between the crime and puniſhment.

The impolicy and injuſtice of ſuch laws have ſtruck ſome modern deſpots, who by their mere pleaſure, aboliſhed capital puniſhments.—This did Elizabeth, and Catharine the ſecond, empreſſes of Ruſſia. Did this mercy increaſe the number of crimes? "On the contrary," ſays Beccaria, "the criminals ſent to Siberia, frequently became honeſt men."——The ſword of juſtice, as it is called, is frequently the ſword of an aſſaſſin. When I take a view of Europe, and conſider the crimes of the great, created, at leaſt, and ſome even authorized, by the laws, and the crimes and the puniſhments of the *vulgar*, I am reminded of the following lines:

> Not far from that moſt celebrated place,
> Where awful juſtice ſhews her angry face,
> There little villains muſt ſubmit to fate,
> That great ones may enjoy the world in ſtate.
>
> GARTH's DISPENSARY.

In defence of capital puniſhments, I know, it is common to produce the authority of the jewiſh legiſlator: but whatever weight may be allowed the authority of Moſes, as it reſpected the Jews, it has little, as it relates to modern nations. The jewiſh law, to ſay the moſt, was formed in barbarous times, and made conformable to barbarous manners. Idolatry and other crimes were puniſhed with death. I may add, that David was full of ſeverity, and Solomon was a deſpot. Shall we ſay to modern governments, and modern princes, *Go, and do likewiſe?* The laws of Him, whom chriſtians profeſs to follow, give no ſanction to the ſhedding of human blood.

No criminal ſhould be puniſhed with death, but he who has deprived a fellow-creature of life. And ſhould I admit that juſtice

juſtice requires life for life, I ſhould be backward to admit that good policy does. We admire the Engliſh law; but admire who will, I bluſh for it, when I read the following declaration of the preſent emperor of Germany, when duke of Tuſcany:——O Britain! learn mercy from a deſpot.

"With the utmoſt ſatisfaction to our paternal feelings, we have at length perceived, that the mitigation of puniſhments, joined to a moſt ſcrupulous attention to prevent crimes, and alſo a great diſpatch of the trials, together with a certainty, and ſuddenneſs of the puniſhment to real delinquents, has, inſtead of increaſing the number of crimes, conſiderably diminiſhed that of the ſmaller ones, and rendered thoſe of a larger nature very rare; we have, therefore, come to a determination not to defer any longer the reform of the ſaid criminal laws; and having aboliſhed, in an abſolute way, the pains of death, deeming it not eſſential to the aim of ſociety, in puniſhing the guilty: having totally forbidden the uſe of the torture, and the confiſcation of the criminal's goods, &c. &c. we order as follows*."—Oh, my country! learn the art of preventing crimes, and you will have few criminals.

We boaſt of the laws of England: but I bluſh for England: I intreat the reader not to ſtartle too ſoon, but to attend to what follows.—In the midland counties of England, from the years 1750 to 1772, incluſive, there were executed one hundred and ſixteen felons. In London, from 1749 to 1771, both incluſive, ſix hundred and ſeventy-eight. In London and Middleſex, from December 1771 to December 1783, four hundred and ſixty-ſeven. In the Norfolk circuit, from 1750 to 1772, incluſive, one hundred and ſeventeen.—In Scotland, from the 1ſt of January 1768, to May 1ſt, 1782, fifty-four.——I here follow Mr. Howard; according to whom, the annual average of executions, only in London, for twenty-three years, was between twenty-nine and thirty. A few years ago, I am informed, eighteen or twenty young men ſuffered death at the ſame time, the oldeſt of whom was not above twenty!!

In Scotland, it ſhould be obſerved, that the poor people are, in general, better inſtructed than in England; and it will be noted by the above ſtatement, that there are fewer executions in Scotland than in England: the difference is almoſt incredible. In Holland, too, there are few criminals: "And of late years," ſays Howard, "in all the ſeven provinces, there are ſeldom more executions than from four to ſix." And a friend, juſt come from the tour of the united provinces, tells me, he does not remember meeting one beggar.

* Edict of the grand duke of Tuſcany for the Reform of the Criminal Law. A few copies only of this pamphlet were printed in England, by Mr. Howard, and, I believe, it is not now to be procured.

I now

I now beg the reader's attention to what follows. The writer is an american, and is ſpeaking of one of the american ſtates *, with which he was thoroughly acquainted. This ſtate conſiſted of twenty-four thouſand inhabitants, and is divided into about one hundred towns. After having ſpoken of certain regulations there, he proceeds as follows:——"There is, perhaps, in that ſtate, not a perſon of ſix years of age, and of common intellects, who cannot read, and very few who cannot read and caſt accounts. Beſides the uſeful books that are found in every family, it is computed there are in that ſtate about three hundred public libraries, which have been formed by voluntary ſubſcription among the people of the diſtricts and pariſhes. Till about the year 1768, which was more than ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY years after the ſettlement of the ſtate, NO CAPITAL PUNISHMENT, as I am informed, had been inflicted within its juriſdiction, nor ANY PERSON convicted of A CAPITAL OFFENCE; ſince that period very few have been convicted, and thoſe few are generally *Europeans*, by birth and education. There is no extreme poverty (continues this ſenſible writer) in the ſtate, and no extraordinary wealth accumulated by individuals †." Theſe bleſſings may be traced ultimately to the repreſentative government. And here, O poor reader! pauſe, and meditate; if the poor people of England had a ſhare in making the laws, Would not ſome of theſe evils be remedied?

The principle of equal and juſt governments is humane; that of unequal governments is cruel and oppreſſive, and partakes of that ariſtocratical inſolence, which too often leads ſome of the higher ranks to treat poor men as *fellows*, whoſe feelings muſt be awakened by ſeverity. The maſſacres, which lately took place in France, and which I never think of without horror, did not proceed from the principle of that form of government now eſtabliſhing, a form which I cannot but approve; but from the conflict of two oppoſite and inconſiſtent principles, which always excite diſorder; from the inveterate habits of long-eſtabliſhed ſyſtems of oppreſſion; from ſuſpicions, diſtruſts, jealouſies, treacheries. Oh! my country, from the horrors diſplayed in France, learn to yield to the hand of reformation. Yield ſomething to the poor in time, (there are ſeaſons when even juſtice carries the appearance of magnanimity) and ſpare, by timely corrections, the calamities of future ages! When the oppreſſed peaſants in Germany roſe, What a ſtorm enſued! But what abominations had preceded the ſtorm ‡! To ſee the tendencies of different forms of government, conſider thoſe govern-

* Connecticut. † Barlow's Advice to Privileged Orders.
‡ Robinſon's Eccleſiaſtical Reſearches.

ments

ments ſettled. Conſider the genius of the american government: it has ſettled into a ſyſtem of mercy. Conſider the late monarchy of France: it was a ſyſtem of cruelty *.—From the laws, I proceed to conſider the expences of government, and the internal police of England.

PART. III.

CHAP. I.

Of the Royal Houſehold, and Public Expenditure.

THE reader will pleaſe to take notice, that in what I ſay on the royal houſehold, I principally follow the authority of Mr. Burke. See his ſpeech on the ſubject of reform.

Strictly ſpeaking, the government of England is a monarchy, and yet it is not: for beſides the five principalities into which it is divided, there is one title, that expreſſes ſupremacy over all the principalities. The king is prince of Wales †, duke of Lancaſter, earl of Cheſter, duke of Cornwall, count palatine of Cheſter, and then he eclipſes them all, as king of Great Britain. The poor people of England have reaſon to complain, that theſe eſtabliſhments, in their preſent form, are ſupported at an enormous expence; and that the principal purpoſes which they anſwer, are thoſe of influence to the crown, of litigation, and oppreſſion to the people. "It is not certain," ſays Mr. Burke, "that the county palatine of *Cheſter* produces any thing." The duchy and county palatine of *Cheſter*, on an average of twenty years, produced, he ſuppoſes, only about four thouſand a year; and even Cornwall, which is the moſt valuable, is not conſiderable. "Yet," ſays the above writer, every one of theſe principalities has the apparatus of a large kingdom for the juriſdiction over a few private eſtates, and the formality and charge of the exchequer of Great Britain for collecting the rents of a country 'ſquire." It were, however, well for the people of England, if theſe were only expenſive and uſeleſs eſtabliſhments: but they coſt ſomething, that is of more value than even money,—ſomething that ought to be as ſacred to Britons as their religion; I mean their liberty. It is no ſecret, that many of the gentlemen, who fill theſe eſtabliſhments, are members of parliament, and

* The decree of the national convention, relative to the emigrants, has been juſtly thought moſt cruel and ſevere. It will, however, no doubt, be reconſidered when the french goverament is ſettled, and peace eſtabliſhed. In the preſent critical ſtate of their affairs, ſome proviſion againſt the plots of the emigrants was abſolutely neceſſary.

† Since the king's eldeſt ſon has been of age, the principality of Wales hath, of courſe, fallen to him.

that

that an appointment in them is to be conſidered as a purchaſe of parliamentary influence.

The ſame kind of uſeleſs expence, and of corrupt influence, belong to what are called the *landed eſtates of the crown*, and the *king's foreſts*. The former, to ſay the moſt, belong, more properly, to the department of a ſteward, than of an officer in the ſtate. As to the latter, the extent of land which they occupy, though it is I own ſmall compared with the vaſt foreſts, which were poſſeſſed by the monarchs of France, yet ſtill it is very conſiderable; and the great ſalaries for rangers, and many unneceſſary officers under them, together with the parliamentary influence to which they give birth, are evils of a moſt ſerious nature. The benefits, too, derived from them, are, comparatively, nothing. A few deer are kept in them, which would fatten as well in the park of a private gentleman, and a few poor men have the right of common. But are theſe a balance for the loſs of agriculture, the moſt fruitful and permanent ſource of national wealth?

The other departments are equally unneceſſary, expenſive, profligate. And let no man be ſo weak as to ſuppoſe, that theſe *gentlemen-ſervants* of the royal houſehold and kitchen ſtudy the art of domeſtic œconomy, or the art of cookery. By no means. The arts which theſe perſons ſtudy, made Mr. Burke ſome time ſince obſerve, that the gorging of the king's kitchen may ſtop the buſineſs of a great kingdom; becauſe the turnſpit of the king's kitchen may happen to be a member of parliament.

I have not, I hope, exceeded the bounds of decency on this ſubject. If I have, I repeat it, Mr. Burke is my guide.

While I am on this ſubject, I am reminded of the royal poſſeſſions at Hanover. A ſenſible gentleman has ſuggeſted the idea, that if œconomy had been the ſtudy of the preſent reign, theſe territories might have been a bleſſing to this country; for the income derived from Hanover, during the preſent reign, might have nearly cleared the national debt. This would have relieved the nation from conſiderable taxes. But the truth is, they have increaſed our taxes, by engaging us in wars. And it has been thought, that a regard to theſe poſſeſſions has produced a certain predilection for war at preſent.

I am not, however, unwilling to paſs unnoticed the royal ſavings of late years, on which high encomiums have been paſſed. But then I have heard it aſked, amid theſe private ſavings, "Have the people been ſpared?" I have even heard it mentioned as a matter of complaint, that the royal hoardings have been enormous; that the late prince of Wales's debts are not yet paid; and that even parliament was applied to, after a late illneſs, to diſcharge the phyſician's bill. With the latter circumſtances

the

the poetical wag, Peter Pindar, has made himſelf merry. The debts of certain perſonages are ſaid to amount to more than a million!

An ancient philoſopher was once ſeen by a friend warming himſelf by the fire ſide of a kitchen. "Enter," ſaid he to his friend, who was about retiring in ſurpriſe; "for here alſo are gods." One might be led to think, by looking into the court calendar, that this was really the caſe in the king's houſehold and kitchen. Here we have a duke for a lord ſteward; an earl for treaſurer of the houſehold; and baronets and 'ſquires in ſubordinate departments, as clerks of the houſehold, of the ſpicery, &c. I muſt again avail myſelf of the name of Mr. Burke, like Teucer ſeeking protection behind the ſhield of Ajax.

The greater part of theſe places, as I have already obſerved, are both expenſive and uſeleſs. But a great part of them are alſo mere ſinecures, that is, the gentlemen who hold them do nothing for them: however, gentlemen, that is, in faſhionable language, thoſe who have nothing to do, but to ſtudy how to place their words, to attend to forms, to dreſs and undreſs, to ſhew themſelves in the boxes at the theatre, to flutter at the ball-room, and the like; theſe gentlemen, I ſay, are always at leiſure to do a *particular* kind of work ſuited to a particular kind of *gentlemen*.

As one evil never comes alone in a ſtate, I cannot forbear obſerving, that theſe uſeleſs eſtabliſhments, of which I have been ſpeaking, have three uſeleſs treaſurers: "Two to hold a purſe," ſays Mr. Burke, "and one to play with a ſtick." How prettily *gentlemen* play with public money!

In all good governments an ample revenue is productive of bleſſings to the people. "But," ſays Sir John Sinclair, "unfortunately the ſtate of finance, ſo prevalent in modern Europe, has an unavoidable tendency to public oppreſſion." This is remarkably true of England. "In no country," ſays the ſame writer, "has the ſyſtem I allude to been carried to ſuch exceſs as in England. From the year 1684 to the preſent time, it has increaſed its revenue from about two to more than fifteen millions a year."

Acquainted, as I am, with the diſtreſſes of the poor people of England, Can I help feeling indignation on hearing that the whole expence of the federal government of America is eight times leſs than what goes to defray the expences of what is called the civil liſt of Great Britain? When I look into the court calendar, from p. 95 to 100, can I help thinking of the poor people of England? And if I ever reviewed with enthuſiaſm the days of chivalry, and even I have had thoſe days, that time with me is paſt: and I view, with ſomething more than indifference, even the eſtabliſhment of a queen's houſehold. The lady of the

firſt magiſtrate ſhould certainly be attended with proper reſpect and dignity; and her attendants ſhould, no doubt, be handſomely provided for: but to aſſign a large ſalary to one lady for preſenting her majeſty with a pin, and to another, for preſenting her with her gloves, &c. is too ridiculous. I ſuſpect, too, as things are now conducted, that the precincts of a court are not favourable to genius. I have heard of no productions of a certain ingenious lady ſince her advancement in the queen's houſehold.

I cannot forbear making one remark, that applies to taxation. It is, that in proportion as public money is waſted in immoderate ſalaries, profligate expences, ſinecure places, and penſions, taxes are to be conſidered as an oppreſſion. In Britain every man, who ſpends his income, pays about one-fifth of it in taxes to the ſtate; and the poor labourer, who earns but one ſhilling a day, pays directly or indirectly in the ſame proportion. The reader, who wiſhes to form a juſt notion of this buſineſs, I refer to a general view of the progreſs of the public revenue ſince the conqueſt, in Sir John Sinclair's Hiſtory of the Revenue.

I have here ſaid, after Sir John Sinclair, that one-fifth of a perſon's income, if ſpent, goes in taxes. I have heard it put down at nearly one-third. It has been ſuggeſted, too, that the taxes principally affect the middling claſſes of people. But taxes, which directly affect the middling claſſes of people, will always in the end fall upon the poor, through the increaſed price of proviſions.

There is another remark, which ought to be made on the public revenue. Let it be admitted, that in the courſe of the laſt thirty-four years, the wealth of Great Britain has accumulated inconceivably, and that an increaſe of wealth will juſtify an increaſe of revenue. Let this, I ſay, be admitted: but, Is it not, at the ſame time, to be lamented, that our great revenues have not been employed for the public benefit? That they ſhould have been ſwallowed up in corruption, parade, and wars? No miniſter of Britain would have dared to place a fair ſtatement of them before the public eye. Have the arts of peace been promoted at home? Have we made ourſelves friends abroad? Have our waſte lands been cultivated? Has the price of labour been augmented in proportion to the dearneſs of proviſions? And, in taxing, have the articles of conſumption been ſpared? Some perſons, it is true, have been gainers; but, Have not the poor been ſufferers?

I take no notice of many grievances of the preſent reign, that have excited the complaints of ſome of the moſt upright and diſintereſted part of the people of Great Britain: ſuch as the oppreſſion of the Iriſh nation; the perſecution of the American coloniſts, at a time, when we were without a ſingle ally, and were

were made the laughing ſtock of all Europe; and by a war, unnatural in its object, enormous in its expence, and diſgraceful in its end: various inſtances of triſling diſſipation, and of ſerious oppreſſion, at home and abroad, too romantic to be treated ſeriouſly, yet too ſerious to be treated as romantic! Theſe ſubjects I paſs by, as opening too wide a field for ſpeculation; juſt remarking, that the evils of which I have been here complaining, are not the evils of the police, of which I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak hereafter, but of the government.——I have followed herein *principally* the authority of Sir John Sinclair, as alſo in what follows, which properly falls within the limits of this eſſay.

His preſent majeſty came to the crown in 1760: at which time eight hundred thouſand pounds were voted to him for life.—This was ſubject to three annuities, viz. five thouſand a year to the princeſs dowager of Wales; fifteen hundred a year to the princeſs Amelia; ſixty thouſand a year have been ſince granted as a ſeparate eſtabliſhment to the prince of Wales; and one hundred and eighty-one thouſand for diſcharging his debts, and for the works at Carlton-houſe. When the eight hundred thouſand pounds were voted, the king promiſed, through the chancellor of the exchequer, to confine his expences to this ample proviſion. Notwithſtanding this, in 1769, debts to the amount of more than half a million were diſcharged. His majeſty then made farther promiſes of œconomy. However, in 1777, a freſh application was made for the diſcharge of debts to the amount of ſixty-two thouſand ſix hundred pounds, or nearly, though the nation at that time was engaged in a moſt expenſive war. The firſt lord of the treaſury, at the very time he was applying for the payment, propoſed an increaſe in his majeſty's civil liſt to the amount of one hundred thouſand pounds. "In a time of public diſtreſs," ſaid the ſpeaker, on preſenting the civil liſt to his majeſty, "full of difficulty and danger, their conſtituents labouring under burdens too heavy to be borne, your faithful commons have not only granted your majeſty a large preſent ſupply, but alſo a very great additional revenue, great beyond example, great beyond your majeſty's higheſt expences." Notwithſtanding this, in 1780, the debts of the civil liſt amounted to ſixty thouſand pounds, and in 1784, to thirty thouſand pounds. So well-grounded was the confidence of the public! "And how wiſe the application has been," ſaid a writer about the time of the American war, "can only be determined, when that application ſhall have been developed by time, which brings to light the hidden things of darkneſs *."—This, however, is worthy of obſervation, that on comparing together the expences attending miniſters to foreign

* Facts addreſſed to Landholders.

courts in the time of king William, when we were at the head of the moſt powerful alliance in Europe, with a period in his preſent majeſty's reign, under circumſtances quite the reverſe, the difference is inconceivable *. The ſame remark will apply to ſecret ſervice money †, and to penſions avowedly paid out of the king's civil liſt ‡.

In the year 1782, it was propoſed to retrench ſomething from certain expences of government: and by the ſyſtem, propoſed by Mr. Burke, annual ſavings were calculated at ſeventy-five thouſand three hundred and forty-three pounds, accompanied with a loſs of influence to the crown, in nine members of the houſe of lords, and in thirty of the houſe of commons.—But after all, the ſavings (by 22 Geo. III. cap. 84.) did not amount to fifty thouſand pounds, and even theſe, as yet, have not been carried into effect. Indeed, Sir John Sinclair ſpeaks of the difficulty of putting this ſcheme into practice: he even ſpeaks of the expediency of a partial repeal of the bill, and, under ſuch a political arrangement, as ours, probably, with juſtice.—But let the whole truth be ſpoken, and light begins to appear, though, probably, our difficulties will at the ſame time increaſe;—our whole ſyſtem of political œconomy is wrong.

In order ſtill farther to aſſiſt the reader in forming a compariſon of the œconomy of the preſent reign, I add the following table:

The extraordinaries of the four laſt years of the laſt war of Geo. IId.'s reign were as follow:

	£.
In 1755,	504,977
1756,	697,547
1757,	1,232,369
1758,	1,166,785
Total,	3,601,678

N. B. The number of men voted during theſe four years, was 347,223.

The extraordinaries of the four firſt years of the laſt war in Geo. IIId.'s reign:

* Theſe, in king William's reign, amounted to forty-five thouſand pounds. In the moſt glorious war of Geo. IId.'s reign to fifty thouſand pounds. In the American war to ninety-eight thouſand pounds.

† In the honourable war of Geo. II. this amounted to forty-four thouſand pounds. In 1777, to eighty-ſix thouſand pounds.

‡ In Geo. IId.'s reign theſe amounted to ſixty-eight thouſand pounds. In the American war, to one hundred and twenty-ſeven thouſand pounds.

In

	£.
In 1775,	845,160
1776,	2,170,602
1777,	2,200,223
1778,	3,026,137
Total,	8,242,122

N. B. The number of men voted during theſe four years, were 314,918.

In the preceding eſtimates I would juſt obſerve, that ſome conceſſions muſt be made to the different value of money in the different reigns.

CHAP. II.

OF THE CHURCH.

OF the church I have given my opinion at large elſewhere; I only note here in what manner it affects the poor. The revenues of the church biſhop Watſon puts down at about two millions a year; but, I am informed from good authority, that they are between three and four millions. Now America affords an example, that government can do better without an eſtabliſhed church, than with it. France, too, has found out the ſecret. The church has made many reſpectable men in France deiſts or atheiſts. I have ſeen in England the gentleman who ordered the Marſeilles' march to be played in a church, where he had an eſtate, inſtead of Te Deum. He ſpake of this as the effect of *patriotiſm*. —"What," ſaid I, "will your country do with the church, in the new conſtitution?" He replied nearly in theſe words:— "My country can do better without it, and therefore, be ſure, will not ſupport it. If heaven wants prieſts, heaven muſt pay them."—That the French can do better without the church, than with it, I as readily believe as Monſieur M———. Accordingly, they have ſold their church lands, ſhut up their monaſteries, ſent their ſilver cheſts and images to the mint, and can afford England ſhiploads of refractory prieſts, gratis. If America and France have found out a truth, how idly are more than three millions employed in England!

I diſapproved of the conduct of the French clergy in France: but I moſt affectionately ſympathized with them in their ſufferings. I diſapprove of a religious eſtabliſhment in England; but the ſtate of the poor clergy I compaſſionate.

It has been obſerved by biſhop Watſon, that if church money were fairly divided among the clergy, the revenues of the church

are by no means exorbitant. The truth, however, is, that a few of the clergy poſſeſs almoſt all the money, while the greater part are poor, and ſome are even ſtarving. The archbiſhop of Canterbury's ſalary is reckoned, in the king's books, at 2,682l a year, but his net ſalary is, I am informed, about 12,000l. The biſhop of Durham's is not very far ſhort of this; Mr. Burke puts it down at 10,000l.; while a poor curate, in the neighbourhood of Durham, as I was informed by a friend, who ſome years ago was in that part of the country, does not poſſeſs above twenty pounds a year. It is even ſaid to be no uncommon thing, in England, for two beneficed clergymen to *conſolidate*, and to hire one curate between them, to ſerve both parishes.—Should not the church livings rather be *equalized?*— Beſides, a great part of the church revenues are poſſeſſed by the laity, as they are called, who receive the great profits, and appoint clergymen, who hold their places under them at a very precarious tenancy, and for paltry ſalaries *. The farmer and hop-planter are injured, particularly the latter, by being obliged to pay the tenth part of the produce of the earth to the prieſthood, more than was even paid to the prieſthood of France, by which the improvement of the land is very much retarded, and the poor labourer, in the end, materially affected. Diſſenters, too, who ſupport the miniſter of their choice, are obliged alſo to contribute to the pariſh miniſter, of whom, probably, they diſapprove. The poor people cannot be even married, without paying a fee, which in ſeveral places is ten ſhillings and ſixpence; and in proportion, except in ſome pariſhes, in which poverty is pleaded, for chriſtenings, two ſhillings; and for churchings, two ſhillings; at a time, when the poor, in a more particular manner, want all their little ſavings, on account of increaſing demands.

What goes to ſupport the bench of biſhops would ſupport five hundred poor families. The eleven prebendaries and dean of Weſtminſter receive, I am told, five hundred pounds a year each: and their offices may be mere ſinecures; for one prebendary only is expected to attend the abbey a month, and for twenty-five pounds he may procure a ſubſtitute. The four reſidentiaries of St. Paul's receive, at leaſt, nearly, if not quite, twice this ſum. Indeed, I have reaſons for believing it is more.—Hence may be nearly eſtimated the expences attending biſhops, deans, reſidentiaries, and prebendaries, throughout the kingdom:—and it ſhould be obſerved, that the ſame order prevails in cathedrals, as in pariſh churches, viz, thoſe who work the hardeſt, receive the leaſt pay.

By the rule, according to which the higher clergy eſtimate the labour of their inferior brethren, ſome of the ſala-

* See the Preface to Liber Regis, by Bacon and Kennet's Caſe of Impropriations.

ries

ries of the former muſt be enormous. A gentleman, who hires the tithes for about three hundred and twenty pounds a year, told me, that he aſked the clergyman, What he allowed his curate? The clergyman replied, "Forty pounds." The gentleman aſked, "Is not this too little?"—"By no means," replied the clergyman. "There is no duty in the week, and one ſermon only on ſundays."—The gentleman continued, "If your curate is well paid for his ſmall ſervices, are not you paid too much, who do nothing at all?" Few men are greater objects of compaſſion, than the poorer clergy.

If the reader wiſh to know how far we are indebted to the church in the article of *liberty*, I refer him to an *ingenious book*, entitled "High Church Politics."—"*Canon* law and eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction ought to be ſwept to hell," ſaid Burnet to Winſton; ſo ſaid archbiſhop Grindal: and ſo ſay I.—I can hardly avoid entering profeſſedly on the ſubject of tithes. A ſenſible man, who had been a juſtice of peace, had ſeen ſuch dreadful inſtances of oppreſſion in this matter, that he flapped his hat, and became a Quaker *.

CHAP. III.

LAW.

DIVINITY, I believe, takes precedence of law.—Our law courts are liable to material objections. I have taken the liberty of looking alſo into them; and find, what I had reaſon to expect, that where parliamentary repreſentation is defective, there will neceſſarily follow a defect in the law.

Some general remarks I have already made on the laws: I ſhall here conſider a few inſtances of particular defects, thrown together without any regard to order.

The regulation, particularly of landed property, entails, and conveyancing, is ſo intricate and myſterious, ſo full of alluſions to ſyſtems already aboliſhed, in a word, ſo irrational and abſurd, that I have heard ſeveral gentlemen ſay, they frequently find it neceſſary to ſay to their clients, who inquire into the reaſonableneſs of their practice, "Such is the law." I know nothing that deſerves to be held up to the contempt of mankind more, than ſome of the proceedings of our law courts; and, Who laugh at many of their abſurdities more than the lawyers themſelves? A ſenſible friend of mine, an attorney, has lately amuſed himſelf with claſſing the ſeveral ſtatutes, under their ſeparate articles, obſolete,

* He was the author of one of the beſt treatiſes, perhaps, that has been written on tithes.—*See* PEARSON ON TITHES.

unjuſt, cruel, partial, inefficient, contradictory, and the like. He was obſerving to me, that under the claſs good, the number was inconceivably ſmall: a work of this kind would be a valuable preſent to the public.

I will not attempt to drag the reader through all the proceedings of our law-courts: but of the forms of law, I would in general obſerve, they are ſo numerous, that the bulk of the people are in fact excluded from the courts of juſtice, unleſs they chooſe to bring their ſuits in *formâ pauperis*, that is, as poor men *.

I am willing to acknowledge great excellencies in many parts of the juriſprudence of this country: thus, in the preſent caſe, that a perſon pleading poverty ſhould not barely be under the protection of the law, but even provided with counſel, and brought through a ſuit, clear of all fees; this, I acknowledge, is an excellence. But, then, in the act of pleading poverty, a perſon may ruin his credit as a tradeſman: and this is not all; for, though he may be brought through a cauſe clear of expence, there ſtill remain to be paid the grievous taxes laid on the ſtamps, which muſt be put on every ſheet of the record: ſo that, perhaps, this pauper will have to pay fifty pounds, without paying a ſingle fee!

The nonſenſe and delay of a ſuit in chancery are only to be equalled by its extravagance. Lord Stanhope † mentions a diſpute, brought into the court of chancery, reſpecting the tithe, not of all the produce of an eſtate, but merely of hay, which coſt twice the value of the fee-ſimple of the whole eſtate. A ſuit in chancery may laſt from one generation to another. "My family," ſays his lordſhip, "had a ſuit depending in the court of chancery in Ireland, which laſted only about two and forty years. All the parties died before it was cloſed, and it ended, at laſt, in a compromiſe.—This is chancery diſpatch!"—I know an Iriſh gentleman exactly in the ſame predicament.

A poor man, however, may be ſaid to have nothing to do with the court of chancery. But the courts of king's bench and of common pleas are little better. The expence, too, of law-ſuits in England is become proverbial. The ſalaries of the higher judges I have already ſpoken of with ſome conceſſions, conſidering the preſent eſtabliſhments. The lower judges, the *puiſne judges*, receive two thouſand five hundred a year, beſide fees and perquiſites. In America the higheſt only receives nine hundred. Mr. Burke has obſerved, whether juſtly or not, I do not determine, that the Welſh judges are unneceſſary, as they might all very naturally fall within the other circuits. The chancellor of the county palatine of Lancaſter is, in my opinion, more ſo;

* Barlow's Advice to Privileged Orders. † Rights of Juries defended.

and

and his income, including ſalary, fees, &c. amounts, I think, to about four thouſand a year. In America juſtice is adminiſtered at a very ſmall price, and with ſingular diſpatch; the number of attornies is comparatively inconſiderable. In England the name of theſe gentlemen is Legion.

Of late years we have heard much of the *independence* of the judges. If any men ſhould be *independent*, they ought unqueſtionably to be the judges: and for this reaſon, I think their ſalaries ſhould be liberal. They ſhould, in my opinion, depend on the *people* for their office, and be placed above the temptation of a bribe. Fees and perquiſites derived from offices, to which they appoint, are below the dignity of judges. But it is affirmed by many, that even yet, though appointed indeed for life, the judge is not independent of *the crown*. Does he ſometimes manage the buſineſs of the miniſter in a court of law? and, Does the miniſter ſhelter the judge in the houſe of parliament? So it is ſaid.—"Look," ſays a ſenſible man, in the open court at Weſtminſter hall, before Lord Kenyon, "into the liſt of peerages for theſe laſt thirty or forty years, and you'll find half as many given to judges; ſo that to carry a bag in Weſtminſter-hall, is ſerving an apprenticeſhip to a peerage*."

We boaſt much of Engliſh juries, and, I think, in many reſpects, not undeſervedly. But even here England is either defective or degenerate. Trial by jury does not, in fact, extend to all caſes, nor to all courts. Of late years, too, almoſt all the benefits to be derived from juries have been ſometimes loſt, by ſetting aſide true verdicts; by finding other verdicts in a new trial, more ſuited to the mind of the judge:—for the court can grant the defendant a new trial, even to his injury, by obtaining verdict of guilty, without finding evidence of guilt,—by eſtabliſhing, adding to, or diminiſhing from the guilt or innocence of the accuſed, at the pleaſure of the judge alone, and by affidavits after the trial; ſo that, as Mr. Tooke properly obſerves, the real trial comes on after the jury is diſmiſſed. Every body hath heard of what are called *packed juries*, which, without explaining the nature of them, have, in ſome inſtances, the appearance of the proſecutor's ſelecting a jury to his own mind. Trading juries have alſo, it is ſuſpected, exiſted, as well as trading juſtices, and hence the cruel proſecutions of many excellent men.

The conduct of government, while I am writing this, has been ſuch, as nearly to have baniſhed liberty from England. Are the days of the Stuarts returning? Or, to borrow the words of divines, Will man's extremity prove God's opportunity?—Men muſt not read, nor write, nor ſpeak; meaſures have been taken

* See Mr. Horne Tooke's Trial.

totally unprecedented in our hiſtory, and aſſociations been formed unprecedented, I venture to ſay, in the hiſtory of the world.

The gentlemen, who conduct news-papers on the ſide of liberty, labour againſt all the weight of the TREASURY! Should not men of fortune counteract this influence by perſonal exertions?

CHAP. IV.

ARMY.

A STANDING army, the only buſineſs of which is to fight, or to do nothing, is frequently found to be made up, in a great meaſure, of effeminate coxcombs, or of bold profligates.—Common ſoldiers are in the moſt abject and pitiable ſtate of human beings.

In a time of peace, with ſo many thouſand militia, if, at the ſame time, citizens were taught the uſe of arms, it would puzzle a much wiſer man than I am, to ſhew the uſe of a ſtanding army; one leſs wiſe might ſhew its evils. In the time of king Alfred we had a *national militia*, that is, the citizens were ſoldiers. In England we had no regular ſtanding army, till the reign of Charles II.

There is recorded an excellent ſaying of queen Elizabeth, to a foreigner, who aſked her, Where her guard was? She went with him into the city, and pointing to the inhabitants as ſhe rode along, gave for anſwer, "Theſe are my guards." Similar to this was the conduct of the preſent king of Poland, on placing himſelf between two citizens. For my part, grave as I am, when I ſee a poor fellow ſtuck up at Buckingham-gate, or at St. James's palace, like a Jack-in-a-box, and dreſſed like a monkey, I am apt to ſmile. When I ſee a body of light-horſemen tearing along like mad before his majeſty, I am apt to feel ſurpriſe.—"Are they flying from the enemy?—Have the French landed? No.——The king is coming: God bleſs the king;—but, Why ſo many drawn ſwords?"

Junius, I remember, makes the following complaint. "Your marching regiments, ſir," ſays he to the king, "feel and reſent, as they ought to do, that invariable undiſtinguiſhing favour with which your guards are treated, while thoſe gallant troops, by whom every hazardous, every laborious ſervice is performed, are left to periſh in the garriſons abroad, or pine in quarters at home, neglected and forgotten." I have heard ſeveral old officers make the ſame complaint; it has alſo been lately made in the public papers. And, Is it not alſo mortifying to ſee a young thing of a nobleman, who has never been in any ſervice, advanced to high rank, as in the caſe of the marquis of Huntley; while a brave man, who has grown grey in the ſervice, ſhall be left to the mercy of

providence?—Where is the reaſon of all this? It is done every day. If juſtice be properly repreſented blind, injuſtice ſhould be repreſented blind, and deaf, and dumb. The ſame Junius obſerves, of the regiment of guards, (ſpeaking of them as a corps) "I fear it will be found that they are neither good ſoldiers, nor good citizens."

The ſame elegant writer further obſerves, "Far be it from me to inſinuate the moſt diſtant reflection on the army; on the contrary, I honour and eſteem the profeſſion; and, if theſe gentlemen were better ſoldiers, I am ſure they would be better ſubjects: it is not that there is any internal vice or defect in the army itſelf, as regulated in this country." Junius, in this inſtance, did not diſcover his uſual penetration.—I venture to ſay, the defect is in the profeſſion; and ſo great is the defect, that the very profeſſion, in its preſent ſtate, will not, cannot ſtand. Europe will not always be dragooned.

England has much to learn, and much to unlearn, on the military profeſſion, as on every other ſubject that relates to the policy of nations. Surely it will afford a ſmile to future ages, to hear there was a time when places were bought and ſold in the army, like ſtock in the alley. A private ſoldier may become a corporal or a ſerjeant-major: but there he ſtops, unleſs, by good chance, he ingratiate himſelf into the favour of a ſuperior officer, who may lend him a ſum of money to buy a commiſſion. How different was the policy of thoſe nations, whoſe military glory has been the wonder of ages! I mean of the ancient Spartans, the Athenians*, the Romans, and of our warlike anceſtors the Saxons†.—Indeed, England is the only country of modern Europe, where the ſale of commiſſions is general, and founded on a regular ſyſtem. The prices, owing to the great abuſes that had taken place, were fixed by a board of general officers, by a warrant from the king in 1765‡.

When France put in practice theſe principles, "that ſoldiers ſhould be citizens; and that a poor man may riſe to the firſt military honours§:" I ſay, when France put theſe principles in practice, England thought her beſide herſelf. Yet was ſhe then realizing thoſe principles, that ſaved here from combined deſpots‖,

* Xenophon. Αθηναιων Πολιτ. Idem de Lacedæmon. Rep.

† Clarke on the Connection of Roman, and Engliſh Coins, p. 440.

‡ See a Treatiſe of Military Finance.

§ Though that part of the decree, that aſſigned the appointment of officers to the ſoldiers, it was found neceſſary to abrogate, this neceſſity appears to me to have originated in circumſtances which at ſome future period will not exiſt. The principle is good, though it may require a more ſettled ſtate of things to put it in practice.

‖ This had in view the retreat of the Duke of Brunſwick, and was written before England took part in the *Combination of Princes*.

—and

—and will advance her to a ſtate of military glory, that England never knew.

Conſidering the preſent degraded ſtate of the military profeſſion in England, the ſight of a man, capariſoned as a ſoldier, is not half ſo pleaſing to me as that of a merry Andrew. However, I had a mind, one day, to ſee the Coldſtream regiment go through its exerciſe before the duke of York. A gentleman, ſtanding by me, who had been much connected with the officers of the army, made the following remark:—"Every officer has a feeling out of a poor private." I reſolved to inquire into particulars, and procured an ingenious pamphlet, intitled, "Advice to the Officers of the Britiſh army*.' The writer ſoon convinced me, that the above remark was founded in truth. Giving advice in his ironical manner to the privates, whoſe wrongs he had been expoſing, the ſame author directs them not to fail, in their turn, to deceive and defraud the officers of the company to which they belong, every way they can; an advice, I am informed, it was quite unneceſſary to give.

I have elſewhere hinted, that while ſome officers receive too much pay, others do not receive enough. To take, as an example, the foot-guards:—The ſubſiſtence† of the colonel is five hundred, forty-ſeven pounds, ten ſhillings a year; his full pay, ſeven hundred, eleven pounds, fifteen ſhillings. But from the cloathing of the ſoldiers, his ſalary amounts to nine hundred or a thouſand pounds, or perhaps, by contingencies, to eleven hundred a year.—A lieutenant-colonel's ſubſiſtence is three hundred ninety-two pounds, ſeven ſhillings and ſixpence; his full pay, five hundred, twenty pounds, two ſhillings, and ſix-pence.—A captain's ſubſiſtence is two hundred, twenty-eight pounds, ten ſhillings; his full pay, three hundred and one pounds two ſhillings, and ſixpence.—A captain-lieutenant and lieutenant's ſubſiſtence is one hundred and nine pounds, ten ſhillings.—The pay of inferior officers I ſhall paſs over, though it would be more to my purpoſe. It is the ſame as in king William's reign, when money was of greater value, taxes leſs exorbitant, and the neceſſaries of life conſiderably cheaper‡. A captain's pay, which I have ſtated, is reckoned the beſt in proportion: yet I am informed by a gentleman, who has been a captain in the army, that even a captain's pay is barely equal to his expences.

The full pay of a private in the foot guards, till lately, was fifteen pounds, four ſhillings, and two-pence, a year, (ten-pence a

* The author, I am informed, was a captain Williamſon.

† This is a certain portion of the full pay iſſued every month, in advance from the pay-office.

‡ See a Treatiſe on Military Finance.

day)

day) but by deducting what they call nett off reckonings for cloathing; the poundage, or one ſhilling in the pound; one day's full pay a year for Chelſea hoſpital, &c. his ſubſiſtence was very conſiderably diminiſhed: from which again were to be deducted, the expences for waſhing, bruſhes, combs, powder bag, flour, greaſe, and ſoap, and one penny a week for the paymaſter and ſurgeon of the regiment.—This penny, however, the poundage, and the money for Chelſea hoſpital, by the king's warrant, in 1771, were returned, and called, very improperly I conceive, the *king's bounty**. The money, paid in thoſe places where the ſoldiers were quartered, was barely four-pence a day. It has ſo happened, ſaid the ſecretary at war, a little while ago, in the houſe of commons, that a private has not had for ſubſiſtence above eighteen-pence or two ſhillings a week, though, by act of parliament, he ought to have received three ſhillings†. I have been ſpeaking of the foot-ſoldiers' pay till lately; for, I think, within a few months paſt, they have had two-pence farthing a day added, as *bread-money*. What a wretched pittance! Yet for this a poor fellow lets himſelf to be ſhot at, and is a ſlave for life, 'till he is either bought off, or becomes an invalid. As an additional grievance, I complain, that his labour is loſt to his family, who are left to ſhift for themſelves, or to be burdenſome to the pariſh. Whence too among the ſoldiers, their bold robberies, and frequent deſertions?—When want ſtares a poor man in the face, he is not always wont to reaſon on the conſequences of a bold adventure.

I know it is ſaid, that our ſoldiers are better paid than any in Europe.—The foot-ſoldiers in England, for example, receive twice as much as the german; and the foot-ſoldiers in France, under the old eſtabliſhment, received leſs than the german. But theſe receive many advantages that the engliſh military do not: and both in Germany and in France the neceſſaries and the luxuries of life are conſiderably cheaper than in England; ſo that the pay of an engliſh foot-ſoldier is leſs eventually than either in France or Germany.

But I do not mean to inſinuate from hence, that the people ſhould be burthened with freſh taxes, to increaſe the pay of the ſoldiers. The truth is, in the army, as well as in the church, the market is overſtocked with officers; the proper means, therefore, of increaſing the pay of the inferior officers and privates would be to leſſen the number of ſubalterns. The grecian phalanx and roman legions had a conſiderably leſs proportion of

* Amounting to ſixteen ſhillings and ten-pence. See a treatiſe of Military Finance.

† See a ſmall pamphlet entitled, The Soldier's Friend. Written by a Subaltern. 1793.

officers,

officers, than the britiſh army. The Pruſſians take the lead in modern armies, in regard to order and diſcipline; and they have one commiſſion officer to every twenty-five, and a non-commiſſion officer to every twelve men. Among the beſt of the german troops, the proportion of officers is one to every thirty-two men: whereas our peace eſtabliſhment is about thirty men to each company, and to each company three commiſſion officers. It would detain me too long to go into particulars: a judicious plan of reform has been propoſed by the ingenious author of the treatiſe on Military Finance, by which a regiment of ten companies would ſtand as follows:

1 Colonel	Inſtead of	1 Colonel
1 Lieutenant-colonel		1 Lieutenant-colonel
8 Captains		1 Major
10 Lieutenants		7 Captains
2 Enſigns		1 Captain-lieutenant
22		11 Lieutenants
		8 Enſigns
		30

In this caſe, as a major died, and he is really an unneceſſary officer, his place ſhould become vacant, and ſo of others. No individual would be injured, and ſixty thouſand pounds a year would be ſaved. Some better plan alſo might be adopted for paying the arrears, and for cloathing the ſoldiers, a plan that might be leſs expenſive, on the whole, and more agreeable to the ſoldiers.—But to proceed with my complaints.

It is no uncommon thing, I am informed by a ſoldier, for a poor fellow to receive 425 laſhes at a time, and it is no uncommon thing, as the gentlemen of the army know, for him to die under, or at leaſt in conſequence of, the diſcipline. The militia, except when drawn out on duty, are not under martial law. But I remember a poor fellow at Cambridge was flogged, and drummed out of the regiment, when not drawn out, who, I am informed, was found dead in a ditch a few days after.

It is, I know, ſaid, that common ſoldiers are uſually a ſet of profligates, and muſt be treated with ſeverity: I admit that they are uſually profligates; and while the preſent military profeſſion laſts, profligates they are like to continue: but pray, in the mean time, What are our officers?—A certain royal colonel has ſeen pruſſian ſervice; and it was but a juſt compliment to a people ſo famous for military DISCIPLINE to introduce a little of it in his own regiment. Heaven preſerve England from pruſſian manœuvres!——I have heard a Chelſea penſioner obſerve, he knew a man who had been eight years a private in the pruſſian ſervice. He might then have been advanced to ſome command: "But,"

ſaid the poor man, "I choſe to decline it; for I had rather be in hell eight years, than in the ſervice of Pruſſia."

While I am on this ſubject, I cannot help expreſſing my ſuſpicions, from what Mr. Howard ſays, in his ſtate of the lazarettos, that there is much miſmanagement in the ſavoy priſon, where the ſoldiers are frequently confined. I could not gain admiſſion here, though I attempted it more than once. This I have heard as a fact; the priſoners, out of their allowance, which is, I think, ſix-pence a day, pay two-pence a night for a bed, which is too much, as I heard a poor fellow ſay, who had been confined in the ſavoy priſon, for nothing but ſtraw and lice.

To be brief, I repeat what I have ſaid before, no character in England is ſo degraded, as a poor ſoldier under martial law. The commanding officer may be a deſpot*; and in ſome regiments, I am informed by a poor ſoldier, if a common man is known to have the articles of war, it is no uncommon thing to haraſs him not a little. The gentlemen of the army know, there are more ways than one of haraſſing the common men. Drilling, at leaſt, is a ready expedient. It is alſo deſerving obſervation, that the articles of war are not enacted by parliament, but made at the diſcretion of the *crown*.

There are ſome people, who laugh at the expreſſion, Citizen-Soldiers. They muſt then laugh at the moſt poliſhed ſtates of the ancient world,—at Athens, at Sparta, at Rome. They muſt laugh at America, at FRANCE. In no department is the remark of an ancient writer found to be more true, than in the army: "Equals are favourable to equals†; and for this reaſon, I believe the French are INVINCIBLE‡."

I will cloſe this chapter with a ſhort remark or two on Chelſea hoſpital. Aſylums for poor ſoldiers ſhould be appropriated entirely to them: and it was well done by ſir Hugh Paliſer, who, I am told, turned out from Greenwich hoſpital all, who had not been at ſea; and, I believe, this rule is now ſtrictly attended to§. The Chelſea penſioners, if I am rightly informed, have all been in the army. Some of the offices, however, are mere ſinecures; ſuch as that of chief gardener, and cook, &c. The gentleman-gardener, and gentleman-cook, and, I ſuppoſe, other gentlemen, do every thing by ſubſtitutes. Mere ſinecure places are a diſgrace to a country. No government is juſtified in ſupporting

* See Advice to the Officers of the Britiſh Army.

† Xenophon. Αθηναιων Πολιτ. c. 3.

‡ I cannot forbear juſt obſerving, with reſpect to our own country, that by the ſtatute of Wincheſter, every man, according to his rank, was obliged to have arms, to keep the peace; and that the laws of England are unacquainted with ſuch an order, as that of a ſtanding army. *See Blackſtone.*

§ I have ſince been given to underſtand, that there are ſeveral men now in Greenwich hoſpital, who have never been at ſea.

drones,

drones, at the expence of the poor. But if, in the preſent caſe, ſinecure places exiſt, Should they not be given to thoſe whoſe pretenſions, at leaſt, are, that they have been in the army? Is not an old ſoldier as well qualified to occupy a good houſe, and to enjoy a handſome ſalary, as a nobleman's *valet* or *groom?*

I will mention an impoſition, that is ſuffered to be practiſed in this charity, becauſe, I know, ſimilar impoſitions exiſt in others. The allowance of meat, which the penſioners have by the rules of the charity, I am told, is ſixteen or eighteen ounces. Now it is well known, that theſe men receive in general not above half that. Why are not ſuch groſs abuſes corrected? All the officers of public charities ſhould have proper ſalaries: but beyond their ſalaries they ought to have neither claim nor expectation: fees ſhould have no exiſtence, and impoſitions ſhould be followed with expulſion.

Some have thought, that the money, waſted in the ſupport of ſuperb buildings and enormous ſalaries to ſinecure officers, would be better employed in making comfortable, at their own homes, the ſame number of men as are now provided for in Greenwich and Chelſea hoſpitals. The wiſeſt and moſt humane plan, in my humble opinion, would be this: to allow a decent income to thoſe, who might find it moſt convenient to reſide among their friends; but to provide for thoſe who could not be accommodated this way, and there are numerous inſtances where this will happen in public inſtitutions.

CHAP. V.

THE NAVY.

THE department of the navy may be reckoned neceſſary, even by thoſe, who think the army not only uſeleſs, but dangerous. It is more agreeable, I confeſs, to the avowed principles of the *engliſh conſtitution.* Some evils that exiſt in the army, exiſt not, I own, to ſo large an extent in the navy. Station is not bought and ſold, as in the army; ſo that a poor man, particularly if well acquainted with navigation, hath a greater chance of riſing. Several poor lads, educated in the ſchool at Greenwich, and in the mathematical ſchool at Chriſt-hoſpital, have riſen to the firſt offices in the navy. We ſhould not, however, too haſtily ſuppoſe that advancement is always the reward of merit, and that the intereſt of government is not conſulted in our naval advancements. In the army, the officers are mere muſhrooms, and ſpring up in a night. In the navy, a man cannot be advanced till within a limited time; but it is no unuſual thing, I underſtand, for *young gentlemen* to evade this rule.

While

While Europe continues to be a neſt of pirates and robbers, as it has too long been; and while the rage for ſhedding human blood, and the pride of conqueſt laſt, I admit that a navy is neceſſary. Wars for mere conqueſt, however, are the wars of governments and of princes: they are never beneficial to the people. With reſpect to a navy for the protection of commerce, I am not ſure, that foreign commerce has, on the whole, been beneficial to this country. However, paſſing by theſe conſiderations, and even agreeing to call the navy the bulwark of England, I proceed to conſider the complaints of the poor ſailors.

Paſſing by the wages of a britiſh ſailor, (which are too ſmall *) I complain, that he often finds it very difficult to get the prize-money at the end of a war. This is put into an agent's hands; but a ſeaman frequently knows not into whoſe hands this money is put, and can get no account of it. I ſhould alſo take notice of the unequal diviſion of it. Government ſhould look into theſe matters. It is not always owing to idleneſs or to profligacy, that we ſee many a poor ſailor begging his bread at the cloſe of a long war. It is ſhocking that poor ſeamen ſhould be dealt unfairly with, to enrich a few ſuperior officers, or ſome low pettyfogging agent of the navy.

Can the impreſſing of men, that is, the forcing of them into the ſervice againſt their will, the making of them undergo harder confinement than many felons experience, and the puniſhing of them for eſcaping from confinement, be called by a milder name than deſpotiſm? I think not. It is at leaſt contrary to the genius of our conſtitution; and this is ſo well known, that, notwithſtanding the forced interpretation of the ſecond act of Rich. II. c. 4. courts of juſtice have always been cautious in deciding on the right of impreſſing. It is ſaid, I know, to be a *right* inherent in the crown; but it was never proved to be ſo; and if it had, it would have been its diſgrace: if it could even be proved to be a conſtitutional right, it would lead many to conclude, that the conſtitution of England is not ſo excellent, as we have been taught to believe †.

Impreſſing does not relate merely to ſeamen: tradeſmen and mechanics are frequently forced into the ſervice. This is at once impolitic and cruel; unleſs, which I ſuſpect has never yet been proved, impreſſing is like inſpiration, and turns a ſimple mechanic into an experienced ſeaman. I ſuſpect many a uſeful tradeſman only ſtands in the way on ſhip-board.

The ſcarcity of ſeamen in time of war, or in caſe of an unex-

* The wages of a ſeaman in the navy are, I think, only twenty-two ſhillings and ſix-pence a month; but this is not clear of deductions.

† Sir Michael Foſter endeavoured to ſhew that impreſſing was agreeable to the common law of England, but was judiciouſly anſwered, in a 'Diſcourſe on the Impreſſing of Mariners.'

pected invaſion, will, I know, be urged: but this only ſhews that we are wrong at the outſet; for if the police of England were properly regulated, a ſcarcity of ſeamen would never exiſt. No wars, except in defence of liberty, are juſtifiable; and in an equal government volunteers would always be found, probably without even bounties. As to wars for conqueſt or plunder, I muſt repeat it, they are full of barbariſm and of horror: citizens and honeſt men have no intereſt in ſupporting them. Indeed, if this part of our police were properly regulated, there would be no want even of volunteers: for more plans than one might be formed, by which there might be a regular ſupply of ſeamen. All ſeamen, for example, might be regiſtered, ſo as to be liable to be called forth to ſervice in time of war; as was the caſe, I think, in France, and ſtill is in Ruſſia: or each merchantman might have certain ſupernumeraries, to be paid by government, who, in time of war, might be placed in the navy: this, I think, was the plan propoſed by Mr. Jonas Hanway*.—Either of theſe plans would be preferable to violating the rights of Engliſhmen, and to reducing a poor man's wife and family to beggary.

The impreſſing of men is not only cruel, but enormouſly expenſive. The following eſtimate I have been favoured with from a gentleman, who made it for a perſon employed by government; and I ſhall deliver it in his own words:—"Every man that is ſecured by preſſing, by the time he is on board of ſhip, coſts government one hundred pounds, and upwards: proved by an eſtimate formed from a compariſon of the number of men actually taken, with the number of gangs that are employed throughout the kingdom at a great expence, without even ſucceeding in their endeavours. Into this eſtimate is likewiſe taken the number of tenders that are employed, cutters, &c. It comprehends, likewiſe, the loſs of men, who are ſtolen away after they are entered on ſhipboard by the Eaſt India company, and other bodies of merchants, who bribe the ſurgeons at the royal hoſpitals, to get the men releaſed by fictitious certificates of ill health." This eſtimate was made at the time when lord Keppel was firſt lord of the Admiralty.

This gentleman further informs me, that miniſters alſo turn the buſineſs of impreſſing, as they do almoſt every thing, to the purpoſe of electioneering intrigue. Twenty voters, for example, have twenty ſons impreſſed: they write to a member of parliament on the ſubject; the member applies to the miniſter to get them releaſed.—Miniſterial favours are always to be repaid.—

I cloſe this ſection with aſking the following queſtions: What is the reaſon that purſers of men of war, and of Indiamen, frequently acquire ſuch large fortunes in ſo ſhort a time? I here put the

* See Remarkable Occurrences in the life of Mr. Jonas Hanway.

queſtion

queſtion, though I have already received an anſwer from ſeveral poor ſailors.

I alſo aſk, Whether it is not an oppreſſion to make the Eaſt India ſailors pay part of their wages every month, as well as thoſe in his majeſty's ſervice, towards the ſupport of Greenwich hoſpital, ſeeing the former contribute towards the ſupport of their own poor at Poplar, and cannot, after all, be admitted into Greenwich hoſpital? And, Whether it is not hard to make the poor ſeamen in the navy pay to the ſupport of a chaplain, who commonly ſays his prayers on ſhore; or, if on ſhip-board, is perhaps the mere bottle-companion of the officers, and by the ſhip's crew is generally conſidered as the lumber of the veſſel?

While theſe ſheets are going through the preſs, I am informed by a penſioner of Greenwich hoſpital, of a circumſtance, which, I think, wants rectifying, and therefore I cannot cloſe without mentioning it. The accommodations, diet, &c. of this hoſpital are, in the main, agreeable; but I think it hard, when a poor man obtains leave of abſence to ſee his friends, that his allowance, even for tobacco, ſhould be ſtopped *. When a man obtains leave of abſence, if tobacco is reckoned a refreſhment, (and with this claſs of men habit has rendered it almoſt a neceſſary) it is as much ſo abroad, as at home. I mention this, becauſe, I am informed, the allowance-money is actually received by ſomebody: and becauſe it is the penſioner's due: accordingly, I am told, there are inſtances of ſome who have actually received it, on a diligent application. The reaſon, why ſo few look into this matter, is, I am informed, the fear of not obtaining leave of abſence again. At Chelſea hoſpital, if I recollect right, the penſioners receive their allowance, when abſent.

If I had any influence with this hoſpital, I ſhould make the following propoſal: either that the men ſhould themſelves receive the allowance-money, as their due, or that it ſhould return to the public ſtock †. The number of men, who, in the courſe of a year, obtain leave of abſence, muſt be very conſiderable;—there are more than two thouſand men on the foundation;—and they are frequently abſent for a long time. I think it was intimated a few months ago in the houſe of commons, that there were ſuppoſed to be more than ſix hundred diſabled ſeamen, who could not get admittance into this hoſpital. The ſurpluſage ariſing from the allowance of abſent penſioners, might, therefore, be employed in very benevolent purpoſes.

I cannot forbear ſubjoining a word on the cuſtoms, which I ſhall do in the words of the friend, who favoured me with the

* It is not ſtopped, I underſtand, if the man is abſent only for a few days.

† I am not *quite* ſure it does not, though this has been hinted to me, and this, I apprehend, is really the caſe.

eſtimate of impreſſed men: "The inſolence of its officers," ſays he, "is made the means of influence to the miniſter. Little il-"legalities are employed as an excuſe for ſeizures to a conſider-"able amount. Law-ſuits, in this caſe, for the recovery of pro-"perty, are not only hazardous, but threaten the plaintiff with "double coſts. The merchant, therefore, to avoid the riſk and "peril of a court of law, applies to the member of his borough, "who takes care to have friends at the cuſtom-houſe, who are "ready to oblige him. Or if this ſhould not happen, an imme-"diate application is made to the miniſter, who magnifies the "favours he confers, and keeps the men in good humour, who "have made the ſeizure, by ordering the merchant to make him "a handſome preſent."

CHAP. VI.

SCHOOLS.

I HAVE by me part of a courſe of dialogues, compoſed ſome years ago, on the diſcipline of public ſchools. It was, therefore, my intention to go more profeſſedly into the ſubject here than my limits will allow.

On the ſubject of public ſchools, indeed, I have already dropped a hint or two; and I acknowledge, it appears to me, that no plan ſhort of one for national education could be deviſed, that would not be liable to objections. The men, who ſhould form a plan of education, comprehending the whole community, and who ſhould be able to forward its execution, would receive the bleſſings of unborn ages.

The moſt diſtinguiſhed of the ancient legiſlators made rules for the early and public education of youth. The inſtruction of youth was provided for by the public laws at Athens, and at Sparta*. A law of Solon's regulated education according to ſtation: but at Sparta no reſpect was paid to literature, and the Roman education, though in ſome periods regulated by law, was too much directed to thoſe who had thoughts of riſing in the world. Perſia had public ſchools of juſtice, from whence no one was excluded by law: but they did not comprehend the labouring poor †. Theſe men are generally overlooked in deſpotic governments.

Various means have been deviſed to remedy this great defect in nations—in Wales there have been eſtabliſhed a few years ago *moving ſchools*, ſo called from moving from one place to another, ſet on foot by a Mrs. Bevan, with very good intentions; and

* Plutarch. † Xenophont. Κυρου Παιδ. l. i.

they

they have produced very good effects. But they move too fast to produce the effect which a regular plan for public education would.

Nor are ſunday ſchools a ſufficient remedy for this national defect; there are many places, indeed, to which theſe ſchools never extended; and in many, they are now diſcontinued. I take no notice of the belief of many of thoſe who ſupport theſe ſchools, viz. that Sunday, the Sabbath, or the Lord's day, is, according to them, a day of ſacred reſt, and that keeping ſchool, therefore, on that day is ſcarcely conſiſtent with this belief; on which principle, I apprehend, it is, that our univerſities and public ſchools give over buſineſs on this day: I ſay, I take no notice of this, becauſe I approve ſunday ſchools myſelf, at leaſt till ſome more general plan is adopted, and am no advocate for ſuch a rigid notion of a ſeventh or a firſt day.

The plan of the primary ſchools now about to be eſtabliſhed in France is, I think, truly excellent. Any children, the rich as well as poor, within certain diſtricts, will be admiſſible into theſe. Common learning, and the means of gaining a trade, might by this plan, be acceſſible to all; and polite literature, be left at large, to be purſued at diſcretion. The ancient Lacedæmonians adopted a plan ſomething ſimilar to this: from ſeven years of age, rich and poor children were diſtributed into claſſes, and educated in the ſame ſchool.

As to charity ſchools commonly ſo called, I have already obſerved, that ſtrictly ſpeaking they are not *public* ſchools. By the very terms of theſe inſtitutions many poor children are neceſſarily excluded from them. The charity ſchools, founded in queen Anne's reign, in 1713, were erected for the education of poor children in the knowledge and practice *of the chriſtian religion, as profeſſed and taught by the church of England.* They have too, I apprehend, departed from their original rules. An order to be obſerved by the maſters is as follows: "This ſchool being only "deſigned for the benefit of ſuch poor children, whoſe parents and "friends are not able to give them learning, the maſter ſhall not "receive any money of the children's friends at their entrance, "or breaking up, upon any pretence whatſoever; nor ſhall *the "maſter teach any other children, beſides the poor children of this "ſchool*; but ſhall content himſelf with his ſalary, on pain of "forfeiting his place." See an account of charity ſchools in Great Britain and Ireland, publiſhed in 1713.

While I lament the partiality of theſe ſchools, I muſt repeat, that I admit their utility, and, perhaps, no country in Europe abounds with ſo many charitable inſtitutions as Britain. But I cannot forbear mentioning the following circumſtances.

I have now lying before me the twelfth edition of *an Account of the Charity Schools in Great Britain and Ireland, with the benefactions thereto; and of the methods whereby they were ſet up, and alſo a propoſal for adding ſome work to the children's learning*, and *an Appendix, containing certain forms and directions relating to thoſe ſchools*. On examining this book, I find, that a great number of places in different parts of the kingdom, having endowments, have no ſchools; a ſalary, however, is received by *ſomebody*, while poor children, who ought to be taught gratis, are obliged to pay for inſtruction. In many places, I am informed, the ſchool rooms are taken down, and it is not even known in the villages, that there are charitable endowments. The author profeſſes that in ſome inſtances he was in want of information. And I have myſelf found, in a little country excurſion that I lately made, ſome places not mentioned in this account, in which I am credibly informed, there are endowments, and the ſalary is actually received, though there are no ſchools. The ſalaries, I have heard, in ſome inſtances, are received by the miniſter of the pariſh.

I am not ſpeaking againſt the miniſters' receiving theſe ſalaries. In ſome caſes they are left to them, and they are comfortable additions to ſmall curacies: but ſome poor children ought to be inſtructed. With reſpect to free grammar-ſchools, I know it may be urged, that the people will not ſend their children, that they do not want latin, that we have no right to uſe violence, as the ancient Athenians did, in driving the poor to the aſſembly of the people. But, in this caſe, it would be no act of ſupererogation to inſtruct a certain number of poor children to read Engliſh. I ſhall never bluſh to own, that I have taught poor village-lads and laſſes to read and write, in the precincts of an univerſity, at a time when I had very liberal offers to inſtruct in politer circles. This I own, at the time, was to me a matter of convenience *. But I know a diſſenting gentleman, of conſiderable fortune, a reſpectable clergyman of the eſtabliſhment, and a family of ladies of handſome fortunes, all well bred and accompliſhed, who uſed to devote part of their time to inſtruct poor children to read, for the pleaſure of doing good. But in the inſtances, to which I allude, it ſhould ſeem to be a matter of duty, to ſay nothing of thoſe attachments which ſuch attentions awaken in poor villagers.

> Truth from his lips prevail'd with double ſway,
> And fools, who came to ſcoff, remain'd to pray;
> The ſervice paſt, around the pious man
> With ready zeal each honeſt ruſtic ran;
> Ev'n children follow'd with endearing wile,
> And pluck'd his gown to ſhare the good man's ſmile.
>
> *Goldſmith's Deſerted Village.*

* It was neceſſary to be near the univerſity library.

I know

I know it is common to ſay, *the poor are ungrateful*, and apt *to take liberties*. Let, on the other hand, the import of theſe two paſſages be conſidered,—Ye have deſpiſed the poor,—Ye ſeek honour from men. Want frequently makes the poor importunate; but ſmall attentions enſure their affection. MONSTERS are rare.

In a village in Cambridgeſhire, and I ſuſpect a thouſand examples of this kind would preſent themſelves to a ſerious inquirer, ſome poor children were ſent to the charity-ſchool by the churchwarden, the principal inhabitant; and they were ſent away by the vicar, at the requeſt of the maſter. Theſe, however, were the children of diſſenters, who probably might not come within the limits of the charity. I am, however, aſſured, that no children of any deſcription, are taught gratis in this village.

There is no charitable inſtitution for which I feel a higher reſpect, and which, I believe, is entitled to it, than Chriſt's-hoſpital, deſigned originally for poor orphans *. This, however, is expoſed to the cenſure of being partial, and, like other royal foundations, is a mere nurſery for the church; and ſorry I am, that it ſhould be expoſed to an imputation of another kind. Certain, however, it is, that the poor man's bread is frequently put into the rich man's cupboard. Preſentations, as they are called, which ought to be given gratis to thoſe who have nothing to pay, have been known to be frequently beſtowed on thoſe who have given a handſome premium to the governor. A few years ago, however, I underſtand, an order was framed by the committee, much to the honour of the governors of this charity, and printed in the public papers, intimating, that if any governor was known to practiſe ſuch meanneſs, he ſhould forfeit his ſtaff; and I would charitably hope, that no governor is of ſo baſe a character, as to deal in ſuch wicked traffic. Many, however, who are neither orphans, nor children of poor parents, but, on the contrary, nearly related to people of large fortune, are frequently admitted into this hoſpital: this is to treſpaſs on poverty, which is ſacred ground.

I remember being on a viſit, ſome years ago, to a friend, who was a governor of this hoſpital. A lady of fortune came to him, in a ſplendid equipage to ſolicit a favour. What ſhould it be, but to aſk a preſentation to admit her nephew to Chriſt's-hoſpital! The gentleman replied, "Madam, I do not think myſelf authorized to give my preſentation to a lady, who can afford to keep her carriage, nor have I intereſt to procure one. I would adviſe you to ſend your young gentleman to Eton-ſchool; I have a ſon there myſelf." The young gentleman, however, was preſented to Chriſt's-hoſpital: and a thouſand caſes, ſimilar to this, will occur to thoſe who are acquainted with this inſtitution.

* See Burnet's Hiſt. of the Reformation.

In ſpeaking againſt the admiſſion of rich people's children or relations into this ſchool, I mean to ſay, that, according to the preſent order of things in England, it is not agreeable to the genius of the inſtitution; becauſe, in proportion as they are admitted, the poor muſt be excluded: whereas it ought to be conſidered as the poor man's excluſive property. To inſtitutions, formed on a principle of NATIONAL education, my remark will not apply.

It is an excellence in this generous foundation, to poſſeſs ſomething of the democratical ſpirit in the diſtribution of literature, which diſtinguiſhed ſome of the ſtates of antiquity. Ariſtocracy is wont to appropriate all literature to itſelf. This inſtitution invites the poor to partake of it. But it ſhould juſt be hinted to men of property, that there are other ſchools in England for their children: and if a gentleman of fortune ſhould happen to have a natural ſon, there are other places to which he might with greater propriety ſend him, than to Chriſt's-hoſpital: the benevolent prince Edward did not intend this inſtitution for the children of the rich.

I am aware of an objection, that is made to giving the poor this inſtruction, viz. that it is putting into their hands the means of corruption from immoral publications. But may not the ſame objection be brought againſt inſtructing the rich? As to public lectures, I acknowledge their utility, and they might be given in the ſame ſchools, in which children were taught the elements of learning. But I ſee no reaſon, why they ſhould ſupply the place of ſuch learning. This would leave the poor too much at the mercy of thoſe, whoſe intereſt it might be to deceive them.

Greater objections, in my opinion, might be brought againſt public lectures, ſuch as were given at Athens, than againſt teaching the poor to read or write: Public lecturers might teach ſyſtems, keep alive prejudices, perpetuate abſurdities, nouriſh oppreſſion.

While I am ſpeaking of what are called public ſchools, I cannot forbear expreſſing my horror at a particular mode of puniſhment practiſed in them; a puniſhment not confined to charity-ſchools, but extending itſelf through the moſt diſtinguiſhed ſchools in the kingdom: Merchant-Taylors, St. Paul's, though in theſe but rarely *, the Charter-houſe, Weſtminſter-ſchool, Eton, &c. And our polite boarding-ſchools cannot bluſh to imitate theſe ancient and learned foundations. I allude to the odious practice of flogging.

One of the orders laid down in the account of the charity-

* In St. Paul's ſchool, I have been ſince informed, not at all, nor I believe of late years in Merchant Taylors,

ſchools,

ſchools, founded in 1713, was, "That parents ſhould ſubmit their children to the diſcipline of the ſchools, when guilty of any faults, and forbear coming thither on ſuch occaſions." If the puniſhment, which I am now ſpeaking of, had been the diſcipline alluded to, this order was full of wiſdom and mercy.

There are ſome circumſtances frequently attendant on this mode of puniſhment, which delicacy forbids me to mention *.—But a boy, who can ſuffer this indignity without ſhame, is, I fear, far from virtue. I have made an obſervation, and I believe it will be found invariably true;—I have had connection with many ſchools, and with youths of the different foundations myſelf;—that in thoſe ſchools where flogging is practiſed, the boys are proportionably bold and vicious: thoſe ſchools, on the other hand, where this odious puniſhment is unknown, I have invariably found to be more decent and orderly. I have, indeed, heard this remark made by ſeveral ſenſible ſchool-boys, who have taſted the diſcipline of public ſchools.

I remember hearing a gentleman ſay, that he ſhould not expect his ſon would make any figure in life, if he could not bear a good flogging without tears;—a wicked expreſſion! only to be equalled by what a certain counſellor ſaid of his ſon at a public ſchool,—"I ſhall not think my ſon a man, till he gets the ———."

"Whips," ſays, I think, archbiſhop Tillotſon, "are not the chords of a man." And I venture to give it as my opinion, that a man, though he ſhould be the firſt grecian, or the firſt mathematician in England, who cannot inſtruct youth without flogging, is unacquainted with the true ſecret of education.——Thoſe who are not poſſeſſed of patience, are uſually the moſt dextrous managers of the rod. They act the part of thoſe idle nurſes, who give children ſleeping draughts, to ſave the trouble of attendance or nurſing †. But ſuch gentlemen are better qualified to be whippers-in to a pack of hounds; the Weſt-India planters might probably find them employment ſuitable to their taſte, in the plantations; or the Turks might employ them among the Moors with the baſtinado ‡. But ſome old Betty ſhould inſtruct my children ſooner than they. Contrary to my original intention, I cannot forbear quoting one piece of latin ‖.

I repeat

* See Quintilian, and the Spectator. † See Locke on Education.

‡ Shaw's Travels into the Eaſt.

‖ Dii majorum umbris tenuem, et ſine pondere terram,
Spiranteſque crocos, et in urna perpetuum ver,
Qui præceptorem ſancti voluere parentis
Eſſe loco. Juv.
In peace, ye ſhades of our great grandſires reſt,
No heavy earth your ſacred bones moleſt;

Eternal

I repeat it, I cannot forbear expreſſing my horror at this mode of puniſhment. One of the fineſt youths I ever knew was nearly whipped to death; and I can point to more ſchools than one, where a weakly and modeſt child has actually been whipped and ſhamed out of his exiſtence. Charity-ſchools require inſpection on this ſubject. Were I an abſolute monarch, I would regulate public ſchools: I would baniſh the rod from every place but the nurſery *,—and the flogger I would treat as a malefactor.

In the politer ages of Rome, as moſt men directed their attention to the bar, all their ſtudies were preparatory to that profeſſion †. I think it much to the honour of moſt diſſenting ſchools which I have known, that flogging is not practiſed among them; and to the honour of our foundation-ſchools, that they practiſe public ſpeaking. The omiſſion of a bad practice, and the adopting of a good one, both favourable to liberty, might be of great public ſervice. In free ſtates, the talents of the poor are ſometimes called forth to public notice.

I cannot forbear taking notice of certain inſtitutions, which have fallen under my obſervation. I mention them, becauſe I think them highly uſeful, and becauſe I wiſh female readers, to improve upon the idea. I have met in the neighbourhood of London, with two or three ſchools for poor girls, entirely under the patronage, and ſubject to the regulations and viſitations of ladies. Women are likely, I think, to be beſt acquainted with the proper way of treating their own ſex, and will, in general, have the moſt proper feelings on what relates to their education, and future deſtination.

At Newington, Walworth, Camberwell, and Horſley-down, there are ſchools of this kind. The ſchools at Walworth are for the education of poor girls, a charity-ſchool for a limited number, and a Sunday-ſchool, with a view to confer on a larger number the benefit of learning to read. The annual ſubſcription of half a guinea, a guinea, or upwards, conſtitutes a ſubſcriber. Once a quarter the ſubſcribers have a general meeting. A committee of ten ladies, a treaſurer, and ſecretary, are elected annually by ballot. Every ſubſcriber viſits the ſchools in her turn, and not leſs than twice in the courſe of that time; the members alſo of the committee viſit the ſchools once a week in rotation, and report to the committee. The children are frequently examined by the ſubſcribers, and their education is ſuch, as will fit

Eternal ſprings and riſing flowers adorn
The reliques of each venerable urn;
Who pious rev'rence to their tutors paid,
Like parents tender, and like them obey'd.

* See Locke on Eduation.
† Cicero de Oratore.

them

them for uſeful ſervice *. Theſe inſtitutions are, I think, highly uſeful, and worthy of being imitated.

CHAP. VII.

Poor-Rates and Poor-Houſes.

THE preſent mode of ſupporting the poor by rates is liable to this inſuperable objection, viz. that people who themſelves require ſupport, are obliged to contribute to others. The plan, therefore, for having part of the ſurpluſage of the taxes applied to the ſupport of the poor, and for aboliſhing the poor-rates, is, I think, humane and judicious. Though a juſt government will have no ſurpluſage of taxes.

However, at all events, the poor-rates ought to be aboliſhed. In America, Scotland, and Ireland, there are no poor-rates: but the poor are not therefore neglected. In Scotland the poor are ſupported by church collections; by ſmall fines impoſed on delinquents; by dues paid for baptiſms and marriages out of the church; by ſmall aſſeſſments, according to the valued rents of heretors and tenants; by legacies, clubs, and donations of individuals. The aſſeſſments are raiſed by the heretors themſelves, by mutual conſent; but are not raiſed at all, unleſs where church collections fail: very different theſe from the poor-rates in England. For in the caſe of an aſſeſſment, "if, after one, or two calls, at moſt, the money is not paid, the perſon may be ſummoned before two juſtices, to anſwer for ſuch refuſal or neglect †, and their goods may be diſtrained."

While I am on this ſubject, I will inſert the following table, with which I have been favoured by a friend; taken from a Report of a Committee of the Houſe of Commons, appointed to inſpect and conſider the Returns of Overſeers, relative to the State of the Poor in the Year 1787.

Pariſh Aſſeſſments to the Poor Rates in England.

" The whole ſum raiſed in England, taken upon a medium calculation on the ſums raiſed in the years 1783, 1784, and 1785, - £. 2,100,587

" The nett money applied to the uſe of the poor, and their immediate relief only, - £. 1,496,129

" The reſt of the ſum raiſed goes in *pariſh entertainments, overſeers expences, and lawſuits!!*

* This account is taken from an Addreſs of the ladies, who have formed themſelves into a ſociety for the education of poor female children, in Walworth, which may be had at Mrs. Gurney's, Bookſeller, Holborn.

† See a ſmall pamphlet, entitled, "The Duty of Overſeers of the Poor, to be delivered to them at their Appointment;" publiſhed 1792.

" The

" The medium expence of lawſuits, concerning the poor-laws, taken upon a calculation within the years above-mentioned, amounted to £. 53,757 11ſ.

The poor-rates are an evil, which ſometimes increaſe through the interference of pariſh-officers. Several houſes of ſmall rents, in different pariſhes in London, were formerly not rated, but now are, to the great oppreſſion of the poor tenants: and ſometimes it happens, that the overſeers abſcond with the money, and, in that caſe, the rate is repeated.

I mention this fact to the honour of a market town in Hertfordſhire, in which, I am informed, five ſhillings have not been ſpent in entertainments, nor five pounds in lawſuits, for theſe five years.—There is a ſmall pariſh in London, conſiſting of, I think, ſeventeen houſes: of conſequence the poor-rates could not be conſiderable. The overſeers, however, uſed to have one or two pariſh-meetings in the year, and twenty pounds a time were conſumed in feaſting: this was ſpent at a tavern.—The pariſh-officers have, however, of late years, much to their honour, had their meetings at the veſtry, and paid a few ſhillings apiece out of their own pockets for a dinner. I mention theſe facts to ſhew, that ſome great evils admit of an eaſy cure.

I cannot forbear taking notice of the great ſalaries paid to veſtry-clerks. Theſe are ſad nuiſances. As a remedy, there ſhould be a committee choſen by the pariſh, two of whom ſhould be viſiters in rotation. We ſhould then hear no more of thoſe engines of oppreſſion, Select Veſtries.

I cannot, however, forbear doing juſtice to the police of my country, in regard to *the duty of the overſeers of the poor*. But, I muſt ſtill inſiſt, that the poor-rates are highly oppreſſive, and that the laws, profeſſedly for the relief of the poor, are, in ſome inſtances, penal: the overſeer, too, himſelf, though on oath, has various means of evading the duty of his office. And during my inquiry into this ſubject, I have met with ſuch inſtances of oppreſſion, relative to vagrants, certificates, the ſettlement, and the removal of the poor, as call aloud for redreſs.

In a work, entitled, " Remarkable Occurrences in the Life of " Mr. Jonas Hanway," I met with the following anecdote: I quote from memory. Mr. Hanway was expoſtulating with an overſeer, who allowed leſs to a mother for nurſing her own child, than to a nurſe who was no ways related to an infant: " True," replied the overſeer; " but you don't conſider, that this woman will take care of her own child, and it may be on our hands a long while; whereas, perhaps, we ſhall hear no more of the other."

I have heard it obſerved by ſome gentlemen, who have particularly turned their attention to the poor-rates, that in the preſent

ſent ſtate of our government, the poor-rates, as now regulated, are the beſt proviſion that could be made for the poor; as voluntary ſubſcriptions would throw the burden on the generous, and leave the ſelfiſh too much at large. But I am by no means of this opinion. In an affair of this nature, there are not wanting reaſons to incline me to believe, that the ſelfiſh might ſometimes contribute more largely, than even the generous. And from a country regulated by the ſame laws as England, I mean Scotland, it is clear, that additions made from other quarters to the voluntary ſubſcriptions, would ſecure a proviſion for the poor.

In regard to the ſituation of our poor-houſes, I muſt avow, that I have viſited ſeveral priſons, in which I had rather be lodged, with a view to health, than in ſome workhouſes in London. In Cambridge caſtle, and in many priſons in London, people may lodge with much greater ſafety to their health, than in ſeveral workhouſes in London. In a narrow lane, and behind this lane, where no air can arrive, are theſe miſerable houſes frequently ſituated; as for example, St. Bride's work-houſe, in Shoe-lane. And in ſome there is ſcarce any court.—When I was ſome years ago at Oxford, I uſed frequently to viſit the poor-houſe. It is placed without the town, in an airy ſituation, and the building is ſpacious. The healthy aſpects of the poor of this houſe, contraſted with their ſallow complexions in ſome other workhouſes, ſhew the great evils attending confined habitations. I had heard Bear-lane workhouſe, in Blackfriars-road, where many whole pariſhes are farmed, ſpoken of in the moſt ſhocking terms. It has, however, the advantage of a large airy court, and this is a compenſation for ſeveral inconveniencies. In ſome poor-houſes the people are ſometimes obliged to ſleep three or four in a bed. This has been known, as a poor man informed me, to be the caſe in a large workhouſe, at Whitechapel, which, however, is, in the main, under excellent regulations, and the building healthy. —And, ſurely, while the preſent ſyſtem for ſupporting the poor continues, every pariſh might find ſome healthy ſpot for the poor, the aged, and the infirm; or, where ſeveral pariſhes unite, the probability is ſtill greater. For my part, I ſcruple not to ſay, that the houſes of fifty rich people ought to be levelled to the ground, ſooner than three or four hundred of the poor, who have ſpent their beſt days in the ſervice of the public, ſhould be ſmothered. In a nation, that glories in its charitable inſtitutions, a poor-houſe ſhould be reckoned no diſgrace, and it would certainly cauſe no interruption, even in the places of the moſt public reſort.

I have dropped a hint on a plan for NATIONAL charity; and this would certainly be an improvement on the preſent ſyſtem of police; but the true policy of nations would be to leſſen the

number

number of the poor, by putting them into the condition of raiſing themſelves to independence. If France does not effect this, the reform there will be left incomplete: the prodigious number of waſte lands ſhould be let out to the poor at ſmall rents, which would at the ſame time relieve millions of poor people, and enrich the country.—France, I think, has no poor-rates.

Among the Romans, the firſt of the agrarian laws, propoſed by Sempronius Gracchus, went to divide the property of the rich among the poor citizens. This law was unjuſt, and coſt the author his life. But the other agrarian law of Sempronius, and ſome other agrarian laws, were wiſe and good, replete with bleſſings to the poorer Romans *, and may probably furniſh the French, when peace is reſtored, and the government eſtabliſhed, with ſome uſeful hints.

England has a great extent of uncultivated or waſte land, which might, in like manner, be improved. Poor people alſo might be enabled to raiſe themſelves to independence by life-annuities, a ſubject on which the late Dr. Price much intereſted himſelf †: by ſuch means many poor people would be prevented from becoming, in their old age, the prey of the keepers of workhouſes, contractors, and overſeers.—Indeed, till the poor can be brought out of that wretched ſtate of dependence and penury in which they languiſh, to inſtruct, is rather to mock them. Put the poor into a ſituation of making themſelves comfortable, and, at the ſame time, give them inſtruction, and you will then be their benefactors indeed; otherwiſe, What do your ſunday-ſchools, your charity-ſchools, what would even national education do for them? —Fit only to diſcover ſights of woe! "Where age goes to a workhouſe, and youth to the gallows," the police of that country is bad.

I am here reminded of a judicious and humane plan propoſed, and, if I am not miſtaken, now ſet on foot by a reverend baronet in Lancaſhire. It is the practice of the poor people in this county (and a moſt laudable one it is) to purchaſe a cow; the milk, of courſe, is of prodigious ſervice to the family. It has been obſerved, that while the cow lives, the family are induſtrious, and live reputably; but when the cow dies, they grow indifferent and idle. The advantage derived from this cow is not merely from the milk, though this is conſiderable; but from that attention, which the cow calls for: this promotes induſtry, cleanlineſs, and a degree of independence, which the acquiſition of property, though ever ſo ſmall, is ſure to inſpire. The plan, therefore, was to have the poor man's cow inſured.

* Livii Hiſt. † Price on Annuities.

I have

I have often been highly pleaſed in obſerving the neat accommodations of the alms-houſe: theſe I take to be ſome of the humaneſt proviſions for the ſober, induſtrious poor; as they bring them into ſome kind of independence. In a village near London, Tottenham, if I recollect right, there are three alms-houſes. Theſe, for they belong to the pariſh, ought to have an influence in leſſening the poor-rates; and this is another advantage of the alms-houſe.

Alms-houſes ſhould, I think, provide not merely for widows, or widowers, as ſome alms-houſes do; but for huſband and wife together, as in thoſe very neat accommodations, belonging to the fiſhmongers company at Newington. A ſingle perſon is here allowed, I think, ſeven ſhillings a week, lodging, and coals. Huſband and wife twelve ſhillings a week, lodging, and coals: a humane and generous proviſion.

The object of this part of my eſſay is the internal police of this country. I have, therefore, ſaid nothing of the ſlave trade. But there is a circumſtance that relates to this ſubject, that I cannot paſs unnoticed. A gentleman informed me, as he was walking one day in one of the ſouthern provinces of America, he ſaw a paper ſtuck up with the following inſcription:——"Ten ſtout iriſhmen and ten ſtout iriſhwomen to be ſold." On inquiry, I find that the iriſh, who, through poverty, are frequently forced to migrate into America, work their paſſage. Their ſervice is ſold prior to their going on ſhipboard; and they are very commonly ſold as ſlaves, on their arrival to America; this ſounds horrid, when ſpoken of a people no farther off than Ireland; if ſpoken of England, it would ſound more horrid ſtill. So partial is ſelf-love!—Who can paint the ſlave trade in colours ſufficiently black?—"Am I not a man?"—I drop the paſſing tear on being reminded of a ſubject, on which a reflecting nation ought to ſay, Oh! that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of ſtreams!——Neither an angel from heaven, nor a fiend from hell, could find a juſt argument to vindicate the ſlave trade.

> The direful voyage to Guinea's ſultry ſhore,
> And Afric's wrongs, indignant muſe, deplore!
> *Guinea Voyage.*—A Poem.

A friend has told me, that he was ſome time ago on board an African trader. On ſeeing a large iron cauldron, he aſked its uſe. The anſwer was, it was to boil horſe-fleſh, or horſe-*beef* for the negroes.—So true is the remark, that the ſlave-trade teaches us to treat our fellow-creatures like dogs.

But to return.—I have heard of a plan of charity propoſed, preferable, in my judgment, to the preſent inſtitutions for the poor. This is, that each pariſh, or where one pariſh is ſmall, that two or more ſhould unite, to have a ſick-houſe, and ſupport their

their own ſick. Such houſes, indeed, if properly conducted, might, I am perſuaded, anſwer thoſe various purpoſes of diſtreſs within their own walls, which now give birth to diſtinct inſtitutions; ſuch as ſick-hoſpitals, the foundling, the magdalen, the philanthropic ſociety, &c.

Indeed, ſome workhouſes have within them good infirmaries, ſeparate from the workhouſe, ſuch as St. Giles's: and in ſome places cells are provided for mad people. This is the caſe with Whitechapel workhouſe. The latter, I am informed, is ſo well attended by a medical gentleman, who viſits the houſe regularly, I think, every day, that in numerous inſtances it ſupplies the want of an hoſpital. The idea now ſuggeſted, as well as that on national education, will, I know, appear romantic. But I am fully convinced, it would go very far towards remedying the diſtreſſes of the poor, more than many people are aware of. Many public charities, indeed, are now little more than private jobs, and give birth frequently to mock philanthropiſts, and often to ſomething worſe.

On the plan here propoſed, many of our charitable inſtitutions would be needleſs, as each pariſh would take care of its own poor and ſick. And to prevent abuſes, and to keep the charities from ſinking into private jobs, the committee of viſitors ſhould be independent men, choſen as ſuggeſted above, and not by one another, like corporation men. Though after all, perhaps, the private exertions of humanity would reach almoſt every caſe of diſtreſs. Man, ſoftened by ſocial intercourſe, domeſticated by family ties, and awakened to ſenſibility by perſonal diſtreſs, is a friend to man: partial laws, and a defective police, ſtop the current of benevolence, even more than private paſſions. In caſes that relate to the diſtreſſes of mankind, there is ſome truth in the following ſentiment:

> For let reſtraint but come, ſweet Love anon
> Taketh his nimble wings, and ſwift away is gone.
>
> SPENSER.

The philanthropy that attends public charities, is frequently ſelfiſhneſs in diſguiſe. He is the greateſt philanthropiſt who enables the poor man to help himſelf.

CHAP. VIII.

PUBLIC HOSPITALS.

A GREAT evil there is, which attaches itſelf to many of the London hoſpitals, as all who have inquired into this ſubject know; they are burdened with fees. Surely this is wrong.

Public charities ought to be as free as the air to all thoſe, who are the proper objects of them. St. George's hoſpital, Hyde-park corner; the Middleſex hoſpital, Mary-le-bone; the London hoſpital, Whitechapel; the Magdalen hoſpital, Saint George's fields; and, probably, ſome others, are expreſsly forbidden, by their rules, to take fees: but all the larger hoſpitals take fees, which, too, are not to be conſidered as the impoſition of individuals; they are, in ſome caſes, regularly accounted for to the governors, as in Saint Thomas's hoſpital; and in one hoſpital, if not more, not only the ſalaries of the ſiſters and nurſes are increaſed by fees, but even the ſtewards. One of theſe charities, I think it is Saint Thomas's, expends about 12,000l. a year, three thouſand of which, I am credibly informed, are procured by fees.

I know, indeed, it will be ſaid, that patients may well bear the fees, being provided gratis with phyſic, attendance, lodging, &c. and that the hoſpitals which receive no fees are the ſmaller; whereas the larger hoſpitals could not be ſupported without them. Some reſpect, though, I think, but little, is due to this reply. For, it ſhould be recollected, that ſick perſons are uſually at ſome expence prior to an application to hoſpitals; and on admiſſion, they are ſuſpended from their labour: generally ſpeaking, therefore, their families are deſtitute, unleſs aſſiſted by *friendly ſocieties*, by the benevolence of individuals, or by the aſſiſtance of the pariſh. On this ground, fees, if poſſible, ought certainly to be diſpenſed with. Nor is it always true, that the hoſpitals which receive fees could not be ſupported without them. For on inquiring into this ſubject, I am fully convinced, that this evil does not always proceed from low finances: there is a very rich hoſpital, Guy's, that receives fees; and there is an hoſpital, the London hoſpital, whoſe finances are very low, that receives none. Surely an hoſpital, and there is one of this character in London, that could afford to pay twenty thouſand pounds, at leaſt, for a new building, one thouſand for a ſingle ſtatue, and a large ſum for ſtucco work for one of their officers houſes, and, after all, have a ſurpluſage of ſome thouſands a year more than they expend, ſhould be able to ſupport the ſiſters and the nurſes without fees. I allude to Guy's hoſpital. Buildings appropriated to charitable purpoſes need only to be clean, neat, and wholeſome; all beyond is extravagance. But the truth is, in our public buildings, appropriated to ſome deſcriptions of ſick and poor, we diſcover a ſpecies of national vanity, for which the poor finally pay: comfort is ſacrificed to ſplendor; and I am reminded of a certain gentleman, who built, it is ſaid, a church, merely as an object to his houſe.

> Who builds a church to God, and not to fame,
> Needs not inſcribe the marble with his name.
>
> POPE.

To ſpeak the truth, in many inſtances, the ſalaries of the ſiſters, nurſes, watches, and beadles, are too ſmall; and when once the notion is eſtabliſhed, that they depend on fees, theſe perſons are not likely to be over-conſcientious; the patients will be hurried out of the wards, before they are cured, for the ſake of freſh fees, as I know is often, very often done: and, in ſome caſes, the poor have no remedy; for, though there are weekly committees at ſome hoſpitals, where the poor people may deliver in complaints, I am not ſure that this is the caſe in all.—Complaining, too, is ſometimes dangerous; beſides that, as in the caſe of fees, where no grievance is ſuppoſed to exiſt, the evil admits of no complaint, and of no remedy.

What follows, I have from a gentleman of great humanity, who is thoroughly acquainted with this ſubject. It is well known by thoſe who are acquainted with the Magdalen hoſpital, that none can be admitted there, who have the venereal diſeaſe: of courſe, it frequently happens, that women muſt go into another hoſpital, to be cured of the diſorder, before admiſſion into this; but the poor creatures are often hurried out of the hoſpitals before they are cured, to make room for new fees, by a ſucceſſion of freſh patients: It frequently happens that young women, who are the proper objects of the Magdalen charity, are obliged to be ſet aſide, on account of the remains of the venereal diſeaſe.

The following account I had from a poor woman, who has a large family, and whoſe huſband, at the time ſhe related it to me, was in a public hoſpital. She paid three ſhillings and ſix-pence on his admiſſion into a clean ward, which were paid, I think, into the ſtewards' hands: after he had been there a week, he was removed to a foul ward, to undergo a ſalivation, when ſhe paid half a guinea more for foul fees, out of which, I think, the hoſpital finds flannels.———When her huſband was to be laid, ſhe informed me, another ſhilling was to be paid; and when he was to be ſweated, one more. To this muſt be added, alſo, the ſecurity-fees, to be returned, if the patient goes out of the hoſpital.

It may be proper, however, to obſerve, that the phyſical gentlemen have no concern, that I know of, with fees; and ſo many perſons coming out uncured, may be owing, not to the neglect of theſe gentlemen, but to the impatience of the ſick perſons themſelves. The teſtimony, however, of ſiſters and nurſes to the cure of patients, intereſted as they are in their ſpeedy diſcharge, ſhould be received with great caution. They are very frequently an improper ground for certificates, unaccompanied with perſonal knowledge.

I have my doubts, whether a ſufficient number of attendants is allowed in ſome wards. Each ward, in an hoſpital that I allude to, has a ſiſter and a nurſe. In a ward, containing twenty-five

patients, theſe, I think, are ſufficient. But in ſome hoſpitals the proportion of attendants is by no means adequate to the number of patients: and I am in poſſeſſion of inſtances, wherein ſome ſick people have abſolutely been killed for want of attendance, either through hurry or delay. I could here relate ſome facts that would make the heart of humanity ache. Indeed, in ſome caſes, patients will ſupply the want of attendants: but in one ward of an hoſpital in which I have been, containing twenty-five patients, either the ſiſter or the nurſe had been diſabled two or three years, and ſome of the ſiſters and nurſes were hard drinkers.—A proper number of ſober attendants ought to be a firſt conſideration in ſick hoſpitals: tenderneſs to individuals may prove cruelty to thouſands.

It was my intention to have ſubjoined a table, containing a liſt of the ſalaries and fees of the ſiſters, nurſes, &c. of the different hoſpitals: but I have ſaid enough to enable the reader to form a judgment.

I have ſpoken of the impropriety of admitting into Chriſt's-hoſpital children who are not the proper objects of the charity.—What follows is much to the honour of that inſtitution, and worth the conſideration of the governors of ſome others. The finances of this hoſpital have, I underſtand, conſiderably increaſed of late years; in conſequence of which better proviſion has been made for the children; the number and ſalaries of the maſters have been increaſed, and an addition made to the exhibitions of the ſtudents at the two univerſities*.

While I am writing this, a reſpectable friend at Bath has ſent me an account of the general hoſpital there, which I ſhall here give. This hoſpital is open to the ſick and poor from every part of the world, to whoſe caſes the waters are applicable, (the poor of Bath only excepted) and is ſupported by charitable contributions. There are many diſorders, particularly the ſcurvy, for which common hoſpitals and diſpenſaries have found no cure, but to which the Bath waters have proved highly beneficial. This general hoſpital, therefore, cannot be too generally known, nor praiſed too much: and therefore I mention it.

The fourth condition of this hoſpital is as follows: Upon the receipt of ſuch a letter, (viz. from the regiſter to the patient) ſignifying a vacancy—the patient muſt ſet forward for Bath, bringing with him this letter, a certificate duly executed, and atteſted before two juſtices for the county, or city, to which the patient belongs; and *three pounds caution money*, if from any part of England or Wales: but if the patient comes from Scotland

* See a ſermon, entitled "The Character of King Edward VI." a ſermon preached in the pariſh church of Chriſt-church, London. By J. Prince, B. A.

or Ireland, then the caution money to be depoſited is *five pounds*. The intention of the caution money is to defray the expences of returning the patients, after they are diſcharged from the hoſpital, or of burial, in caſe they die there. The remainder of the caution money, after theſe expences are defrayed, is returned to the perſon who depoſited it.

Now I do not know that there are any proper fees belonging to this hoſpital; but I think, with ſubmiſſion, that even the caution money might be diſpenſed with.

Bath is reſorted to by people of fortune from all parts; and this charity is, I apprehend, ſupported by their contributions. A ſmall additional contribution, for the purpoſe of conveying the patients to Bath, might make a ſeparate fund to ſupply the place of caution money, and conſidering the ample funds from whence theſe contributions are uſually collected, it would hurt nobody. I mention theſe circumſtances, becauſe I have no doubt that many perſons, who are the proper objects of the charity, are yet debarred its benefits, from the difficulty of raiſing the caution money.

I cloſe this ſection with the following extract from the ACCOUNT of the PROCEEDINGS at St. George's Hoſpital, Hyde-park Corner, as publiſhed by order of the General Board, Friday, 17th Dec. 1792:—"That no governor, officer, or ſervant, muſt at any time preſume, upon pain of expulſion, to take of any tradeſman, patient, or other perſon, any fee, reward, or gratuity, of any kind, directly or indirectly, for any ſervice done or to be done, on account of this hoſpital."—The bye-laws of the Magdalen hoſpital, publiſhed in 1792, are alſo entitled to particular reſpect.

CHAP. IX.

PRISONS.

I HAVE already dropped a hint or two on priſons: the whole ſyſtem has been humanely expoſed by that ornament to his country, Mr. Howard; and much to the honour of this country, and highly beneficial to good morals, will it prove, when it ſhall be more generally attended to!—Some few evils, indeed, particularly relating to cleanlineſs and health, have already been remedied, and ſome houſes conſtructed upon Mr. Howard's plan: but this attention has been very partial; greater part of the evils ſtill remain.

I have already ſpoken againſt confining priſoners for debt, in idleneſs: it is well known, that debtors frequently cannot procure

cure the groats*. When I viſited the Compter, a year or two ago, if I recollect right, there were thirty-eight debtors, four only of whom had received their groats. I think, too, this is a priſon where the gaoler has no ſalary, but even pays rent and ſervants' wages: his ſupport, therefore, muſt depend on fees. It is horrid, that priſoners ſhould pay at going in and coming out of gaol, and be kept idle and half-ſtarved into the bargain. The cuſtoms of our priſons frequently "raiſe the genius, but rarely mend the heart." Indeed, it ſhould ſeem as if our gaolers, in common caſes, thought fees the principal end of their appointment: for if a young man ſhould chance to get into a frolic, and be thrown into the Compter for a ſingle night, he muſt pay four ſhillings and ſixpence; and if he have a bed, two ſhillings more, as I have been informed by a young man who was confined there one night. Fees, therefore, ſtill exiſt; and theſe are not to be conſidered as an impoſition. The table of fees is hung up in moſt priſons; and the gaoler demands his *dues*, though fees are frequently taken which they have no right to demand.

That the reader may form ſome judgment of this matter, I will preſent him with the following tables, which may be ſeen in Mr. Howard's State of the Priſons:

	£.	s.	d.
Every priſoner, on the maſter's ſide, ſhall pay to the keeper for his entrance fee - - - -	0	3	0
Every priſoner, on the maſter's ſide, ſhall pay for chamber-room, uſe of bedding and ſheets, to the keeper, there being two in a bed, and no more, each, per week - - - - - -	0	1	3
Every priſoner, on the ſaid maſter's ſide, who, at his own requeſt, ſhall have a bed to himſelf, ſhall pay to the keeper for chamber-room, uſe of bedding, and ſheets, per week - - - - -	0	2	6
Every debtor ſhall pay to the keeper for his diſcharging-fee - - - - - - -	0	6	10
And to all the turnkeys two ſhillings, and no more	0	2	0

N. B. The above table was ſettled the nineteenth of December, 1729. The following was given to the late Mr. Akerman, when he was made keeper.

Fees to be taken by the Keeper of Newgate.

For every debtor's diſcharge - - -	0	8	10
For every felon's diſcharge - - - -	0	18	10
For every miſdemeanor - - - -	0	14	10

* Four-pence a day, which debtors have a right to receive from their creditors, by the 32d Geo. II.

	£.	s.	d.
Every debtor's entrance on the maſter's ſide -	0	3	0
Every felon's entrance on the maſter's ſide -	0	10	6
Every perſon admitted into the preſs-yard - -	3	3	0
For every tranſport's diſcharge - - -	0	14	10
For every bailable warrant - - - -	3	6	8

The Garniſh in Newgate.

Debtors - - -	0	5	6
Felons - - - -	0	2	6

It is unneceſſary to preſent the reader with the tables of fees in other priſons.

Garniſh ſtill exiſts in priſons; and the old ſaying, "Pay, or ſtrip," to priſoners, on their admiſſion, ſtill, I ſuppoſe, is uſed. Garniſh is entrance-money paid to the priſoners by a new comer.

County priſons ought to be inſpected by the ſheriff and magiſtrates of the county, and abuſes rectified: how far this is the caſe, I will not determine: but moſt devoutly is it to be wiſhed, that a ſucceſſion of ſuch men as Howard might ariſe, men of eaſy fortune and independent ſpirit, who might look into the grievances of priſons, and make a true report, not barely in an official capacity, but from the dictates of pure humanity; men not over-delicate or too timorous, but patient, mild, perſevering. The following ſubjects are worthy of ſtill farther inveſtigation:—Fees—allowance—air—legacies—gaolers' ſhare in the bread—fire—ſewers—garniſh—tap—irons—gaol delivery—want of light—no employment for priſoners—non-reſidence of gaolers—confinement of debtors, felons, and miſdemeanors together. If ſome man, like Howard, ſhould again riſe, no mock philanthropiſt, and purſue his ſteps; ſhould he examine how far Mr. Howard's propoſed improvements have been adopted, expoſe exiſting grievances, or propoſe regulations of his own, he would be a bleſſing to this country. But I repeat it, he ſhould be no mock philanthropiſt; ſuch a man would ſoon grow weary of the taſk, and, after all, would only be a tyrant or a trifler. He ſhould be a good man. The few viſits that I have made to priſons, after reading the more popular parts of Mr. H.'s book, were made under circumſtances different from Howard, that I might be able to ſpeak from obſervation.

I had once the curioſity to call at what is called a ſpunging-houſe. I was informed from good authority, that a fellow, who keeps one of theſe houſes, exacted five guineas one week for the board of a Mr. P———. The groſs impoſitions of theſe places are notorious. The law, indeed, has made certain proviſions againſt them, though to very little purpoſe: but ſurely theſe execrable houſes are not at all neceſſary; or, at leaſt, the rules, which are formed to preſerve the unfortunate from the harpies

who

who reſide in them, ſhould infallibly operate. This, however, may not be expected while bailiffs keep public-houſes.

It has fallen in my way to meet with ſeveral, now under confinement, for uttering ſeditious words, or for publiſhing ſeditious books: two beſides being heavily fined, are to be impriſoned for four years, and one has been entirely ſat aſide from his profeſſion, beſides being ſentenced to impriſonment and the pillory. A few weeks ago, I viſited a poor man in Chelmsford-gaol, who, when in liquor, had uttered a few idle words. He had been in ſolitary confinement for nearly ſix months. I make no remarks on theſe caſes; only obſerving, that ſome of theſe ſentences appear too ſevere, even admitting the crime; particularly Mr. Froſt's, Mr. Ridgeway's, and Mr. Symonds's; and in one of the indictments, that I have in my eye, I have every reaſon, without entering into pros and cons, to believe, that part of the information *, was, at leaſt, falſe. But certain proſecutions have been commenced at Mancheſter, that fill me with the mixed ſenſations of pity, horror, and indignation.

The caſe alluded to, is not that of Mr. Walker, of Mancheſter; though a proſecution is commenced againſt that reſpectable gentleman.—Death has intervened, and it is too late to complain!—My ſoul, come not thou into their ſecret! I turn from the dreadful tale, and relieve my mind, by propoſing a little work of benevolence to the affluent and humane.

It relates to the caſe of perſons confined for ſmall debts. I am informed, that the liberality of thoſe gentlemen, who have aſſociated to relieve ſmall debtors, does not, in many inſtances, reach the caſe. Their bounty, I underſtand, through the numerous caſes, that fall under their obſervation, is neceſſarily confined. A ſmall ſum, therefore, in addition to what this ſociety allows, is ſometimes neceſſary to procure the diſcharge of ſuch debtors. Men of fortune, I think, might well employ themſelves in inquiring after ſuch caſes. The families, too, of perſons thus confined, might be worth their notice. The caſe of many debtors, ſuch as thoſe confined on exchequer proceſſes, and for large debts, cannot, perhaps, be remedied, but their families might be relieved.

* Mr. Cooke, baker, of Cambridge, was charged with ſaying, "damn the monarchy." I undertake to vindicate nothing imprudent or wrong either in Mr. Cooke, or any other man: but he has ſolemnly aſſured me, he never uſed this expreſſion: and I believe it. I lodged with him a twelvemonth when at Cambridge, and know him not to be in the habit of uſing ſuch language.

CHAP. X.

Feudal and Seignoral Rights—Labourers—and Manufacturers.

I CANNOT forbear noticing ſome remains of that barbarous ſyſtem, called feudal, which, though its ſeverity is ſomewhat abated in modern times, has ſtill left behind it many inſtances of oppreſſion in Britain. The effects of this ſyſtem in roman catholic countries are cruel and impious. Great families are divided—the younger branches of them turned into beggars—and *religious* houſes filled with praying nuns, and dreaming monks. In a ſmall collection of poems, lately publiſhed, there is an alluſion to the devotion of theſe religious houſes * :—

> But ſee! a rev'rend form ariſe,
> With beck'ning hands and ſtreaming eyes,
> "Where la Trappe's ſilent vot'ries weep,
> Or virgins midnight vigils keep:
> The cloyſter drear, the gothic gloom,
> Break the dark diſtance of the tomb;
> Ah! thither—reſtleſs rover flee,
> And there ſweet peace ſhall lodge with thee:"
> Vain boaſt of frantic zeal, and ſullen care,
> Praying 'mid ſighs and groans, or muſing in deſpair!

I have not words to expreſs my horror at this cruel policy. In England the law of primogeniture makes the younger branches of rich families poor; throws them as penſioners on the public purſe; forms them into creatures and tools of factions; or makes them fly for ſhelter into the navy, the army, the law-courts, and the church; men, perhaps, without courage, without experience, without knowledge, without piety. To ſee a family compoſed, ſuppoſe, of twelve children, living at the ſame table, formed into the ſame habits, and accuſtomed to the ſame connections, and then dividing, in future life, the one perhaps on an eſtate of twelve thouſand pounds a year, the reſt on a few hundreds, is offering violence to nature. To females, towards whom the preſent cuſtoms of ſociety are on other accounts peculiarly unfavourable, to whom, therefore, parental regards ought at leaſt to have ſhewn impartiality; to females, I ſay, the law of primogeniture is peculiarly unfavourable. To this unnatural law are to be traced the proſtitution of many young women of good birth, and the unſuitable connections which they form, merely to procure a maintenance.—If Mr. Paine had never written any thing, but a few affecting pages on this ſubject, he would have left impreſſions of reſpect on my heart, which no proſecutions will ever be able to obliterate.

Though the greater outlines of feudal vaſſalage were ſome of them removed, about a century ago, in England, many of them,

* Poems, by G. Dyer.

I repeat

I repeat it, ſtill remain. Theſe prevent the improvement of land, which is beſt promoted on ſmall eſtates, where proprietors cultivate the land, not for a lord, but for themſelves. *Seignoral rights* are yet attached to almoſt every current of water—to mill-ſtreams—fiſh-ponds—and foreſts;—they are to be ſeen in the diſtribution of villages and of farms; each of which has ſome ſeignoral impoſitions and claims between great and little lords. Theſe *rights*, as they are called, of lords of manors and great landholders, the remains of ancient vaſſalage, prove wrongs to the poor: they are to be reckoned among the circumſtances that ſpread poverty among the lower ranks of people in the country. And ſince incloſures have prevailed, the great farmers and landholders ſwallow up the leſs: hence the ſmall farmer becomes a labourer; and hence the deſerted village.

> Ill fares the land, to haſt'ning ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates, and men decay;
> Princes and lords may flouriſh, or may fade,
> A breath may make them, as a breath has made;
> But a bold peaſantry, their country's pride,
> When once deſtroy'd, is ne'er to be ſupply'd.
>
> *Goldſmith's Deſerted Village.*

The day-labourer's wages in many places in Cambridgeſhire, Huntingdonſhire, and Bedfordſhire, are but ſix ſhillings a week, and a meſs in the morning: in ſome places a trifle more *: but I have been informed, that ten pence a day only is received in ſome villages in Huntingdonſhire. Theſe matters will, I hope, be looked into by ſome humane gentlemen.

A gentleman, who has an eſtate at Longford, a midland county of Ireland, informs me, that the iriſh cotters received from him, only ſixpence a day, and that even this was an increaſe of their wages; for the labourers at Longford, and the neighbouring country, had been accuſtomed to receive only fivepence, till he raiſed the wages of his men. On the ſide of earnings, however, are to be added, the ſelling of a pig, and butter, which is about forty-five ſhillings a year, together with yarn, and a calf, the value of which I do not now recollect; and on the ſide of expences, houſe and garden, paſture for a cow, oatmeal, rent of potatoe ground, flax ground, flax ſeed, wool, and hearth money. But the outſide of their regular wages, was ſixpence a day.

I was ſtruck with the remark of a ſenſible and humane gentleman-farmer, in Hertfordſhire: pointing to ſome of his labourers, he obſerved to me, How comfortable is the doctrine of a future ſtate to theſe poor fellows, who are little better than ſlaves in this!

* Since the publication of the firſt edition of this work, wages have been raiſed a little.

I do

I do not profeſs to have any accurate rule of proportion, by which I can judge what a day-labourer ought to receive; and I know that many of the ſmall farmers are themſelves very poor. But I am ſure a day-labourer ought to receive more; I am alſo ſure, notwithſtanding what I have ſaid, that farmers can afford to give more. In ſome parts of Eſſex, I underſtand, and, in one or two other counties, the farmers have lately raiſed the labourers' wages a ſhilling a week. In the neighbourhood of London, I think, the labourer receives two ſhillings a day: here, indeed, living is dearer than in the country.

The condition alſo of ſome poor manufacturers in our large trading towns, though in many inſtances better than that of the day-labourers, deſerves conſideration.—The large fortunes acquired in many of our manufactures, prove to me, that the price of labour is much under-rated. I do not ſee how the force of this rule can be evaded, viz. that the profits of the labourer ſhould bear ſome proportion to thoſe of the maſter. Let a conſcientious benevolent man turn his attention for a moment to the condition of our great manufacturers, and let him contraſt it with that of the men, who take the labouring oar*; and if he do not find cauſe for cenſure, I ſhall not think him poſſeſſed of a great ſtock of benevolence.

The poor, I believe, ſeldom *ſtrike*, as it is called, without reaſon; but when they do, the conſequences may prove very ſerious. I ſaw an inſtance of this in a county where I lately was on a viſit. The colliers had ſtruck for more wages. The conſequence was, coals became immoderately dear; and I was informed, that in a little time there would be none. This evil was increaſed by the ſeaſon proving wet, in conſequence of which the poor could get no *die*, which, in the winter, they uſed for firing. It was God's mercy, however, that the ſeaſon proved mild.

A moſt ſerious evil it is, though not ſufficiently conſidered, that our maſter-manufacturers no ſooner grow rich by their great gains, than they are apt to haſten to ſhare the luxuries of the metropolis, and the ſplendor of the court, inſtead of benefiting the country by living in it. Incredible as it may appear, it is eſtimated that half the landed property of the country is ſpent in London, and a great part of the property acquired in Scotland and Ireland muſt be added to the ſtock. Hence we may eaſily account for the poverty of the country people in England, and particularly in Ireland and Scotland.

I ſubmit to the reader's conſideration, the following table without any apology, communicated to me by a reſpected friend.

* In ſome manufactures, I know, large wages may be earned. What I here ſay, applies not to all.

Expences

Expences and Earnings of Six Families of Labourers, by the week, and by the year.

Account of the Families.

No. I. A man, his wife, & five children, the eldeſt eight, the youngeſt an infant.

No. II. A woman and ſix children, four of whom too young to work.

No. III. A man, his wife, and 4 ſmall children, the eldeſt under ſix years.

No. IV. A man, his wife, and 3 ſmall children, the eldeſt not five years old.

No. V. A man, his wife, and three young children, the eldeſt ſix years of age.

No. VI. A man, his wife, and 2 children, the eldeſt ſeven years of age, the youngeſt four.

Neceſſaries.	No. I. 7 Perſons.			No. II. 7 Perſons.			No. III. 6 Perſons.			No. IV. 5 Perſons.			No. V. 5 Perſons.			No. VI. 4 Perſons.		
Expences per Week.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Bread or Flour,	0	6	3	0	5	5	0	5	0	0	2	6	0	3	9	0	4	2
Yeaſt and Salt,	0	0	4	0	0	3½	0	0	3½	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	3
Bacon, or other Meat,	0	0	8	0	1	4	0	0	8	0	1	9	0	1	8	0	1	9
Tea, Sugar, Butter,	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	2½	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cheeſe (ſeldom any),	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2½	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beer (ſeldom any),	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soap, Starch, Blue,	0	0	2¼	0	0	2½	0	0	2¼	0	0	3	0	0	6	0	0	2¼
Candles,	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	3
Thread, Thrum, Worſted,	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	3
Total,	0	8	11¼	0	8	9	0	7	7¾	0	6	11½	0	7	8	0	6	11½
Amount per ann.	23	4	9	22	15	0	19	17	7	18	0	9	19	18	8	18	0	9
Earnings per Week.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
The Man earns,	0	8	0	Parish	5	0	0	8	0	0	8	4	0	8	0	0	8	0
The Woman	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	6	0	0	8	0	1	0	0	0	6
The Children,	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total,	0	8	6	0	9	0	0	8	6	0	9	0	0	9	0	0	8	6
Per ann.	22	2	0	23	8	0	22	2	0	23	8	0	23	8	0	22	2	0
To the amount of Expences per ann.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
	23	4	9	22	15	0	19	17	7	18	0	9	19	18	8	18	0	9
Add Rent, Fuel, Cloaths, Lying-in,	6	0	0	6	0	0	6	0	0	6	0	0	6	0	0	6	0	0
Total Expences per ann.	29	4	9	28	15	0	25	17	7	24	0	9	25	18	8	24	0	9
Total Earnings per ann.	22	2	0	23	8	0	22	2	0	23	8	0	23	8	0	22	2	0
Deficiency of Earnings,	7	2	9	5	7	0	3	15	7	0	12	9	2	10	8	1	18	9

In No. V. The woman waſhes for one or two men, hence 6d. for ſoap.
In No. IV. The charge for bread is leſs than in the others, becauſe that family, by buying a whole hog at once, has, for the ſame money, almoſt double the quantity of meat which others get, who buy by retail, and therefore leſs bread is required.

ANNUAL EXPENCES.

	£.	s.
Rent of a cottage & garden, from 1l. 5s. to 2l. 2s.	1	10
Cloathing is eſtimated for each family at	2	10
Lying-in, ſickneſs, and loſs of time thereby, burials, and loſs of time by bad weather, eſtimated one year with another,	1	12
Fuel, if bought, coſts 12s. but reckoned at a week's wages, becauſe a man can cut turf enough on a common in a week for a year,	0	8
Annual Expences,	£. 6	0

Price of half peck loaf,	0	0	11½
—of a gallon of flour,	0	0	10
—of a week's labour,	0	8	0

Tea uſed by a family is from 1 oz. to 1½ oz. at 2d. per oz.

Soft Sugar, ½ lb. at 7d. or 8d. per lb.

Butter or Lard, ½ lb. at 7½d. or 8d. per lb.

Cheeſe, the deareſt article to buy with the poor.

Malt, too dear to brew, except againſt a lying-in or chriſtening.

To eke out the ſoap, they uſe fern burnt.

N. B. The above ſtatement ſhews the real *earnings* and *expences* of ſix labouring families in a country pariſh in Berkſhire; they were collected at Eaſter, 1787, by the miniſter of the pariſh in perſon, who received the particulars from the families, guarding as well as he could againſt deceptions. Thus far my friend.—It will be obſerved by this ſtatement, that the expences exceed the earnings 7l. 2s. 6d. This deficiency, therefore, is to be made up, I apprehend, by the increaſe of wages, received in harveſt; by gleanings, by applications to the pariſh in times of emergency, by occaſional bounties, particularly of fuel, which it is much to be wiſhed were more general, in the winter, from generous individuals; by collecting die or furze; by breaking hedges; or by keeping conſtantly in debt with ſhopkeepers. Some years ago, in order to be near the printer, when I was publiſhing a book, I boarded with an honeſt decent woman, who kept a ſhop: I uſed frequently to hear her complain, that the poor people were perpetually getting into her debt, and that when ſhe demanded the payment, though perhaps only five or ſix ſhillings, they would leave her ſhop and go to another. One poor man ſhe particularly mentioned: this is the man of whom I elſewhere obſerve, that he had a ſickly wife, and nine children, and that he could only earn a ſhilling a day by working on the public road. This man aſſured me, that it was abſolutely impoſſible for him to keep out of debt.

PART IV.—CHAP. I.

ADDRESS

TO

THE FRIENDS OF LIBERTY.

I HAVE now finiſhed in part this imperfect ſketch of the wrongs of the poor people of England. It has been taken from undoubted authorities; partly from books, and facts, into which I have myſelf accurately inquired; and partly from accounts given me by perſons immediately concerned. Some little inaccuracies there may probably be found, but I believe none, that will affect the truth of any facts: It would not, however, have been prudent or generous to have produced all my authorities; though I ſhould not be afraid to appeal for the truth of my relation to thoſe reſpective inſtitutions, which I have examined. I have not addreſſed theſe reflections to the government; this would have looked like preſumption: though I have touched on ſome grievances, which it would be the intereſt of government to remove. But I do not profeſs to have a greater portion of modeſty than my neighbours: it would ſcarcely have been conſiſtent with my principles to have addreſſed the legiſlature excluſively, which I cannot conſider as an equal repreſentation of the people. To the friends of reform, whether they make part of the legiſlature or no, I addreſs myſelf. I addreſs myſelf to the people of England.

Many of the evils, that I have been complaining of, relate to the police, and depend on the original imperfections of ſome charitable inſtitutions, on ſome unforeſeen departure from original rules, or on the miſconduct of individuals.—Many of them, I acknowledge, are not to be charged on government; and happy ſhall I be with reſpect to theſe, if I ſhall have pointed out any evils which admit of a remedy; or if I ſhall have ſuggeſted one idea that may lead others to inquire farther into grievances, which they may be able to relieve. If I might indulge the hope, that the ſituation of one poor perſon might be rendered more comfortable through my attempts, I ſhall have to comfort myſelf, that I have not entirely thrown away my time.

But, reader, be not content with ſaying, that the police of England is better than that of many other nations: I am willing to admit it. We have no inquiſitions, as they have in Spain; no baſtille, as they had in France; no lettres de cachet; our cities

and

and our houſes are, in general, healthily ſituated, and our charitable inſtitutions are the envy of many modern nations. But we ſhould recollect, that we boaſt of having the BEST government in the world; and it ſhould ſurely humble us, that in what relates to our criminal code, and the regulation of the army, &c. we are inferior to ſome modern deſpotic governments. As to the condition of our poor, it is in many caſes bad; it might be made better; and the grievances, which attend ſome of our charitable inſtitutions, might be eaſily remedied by the governors or directors;—but if they fly from the taſk, it would be generous in government to take it up;—and let us not be backward to own, (it ſhould operate as a ſpur), that in ſome nations the police is better than the government.

Where a government is juſt, the police will in general be good: there may, indeed, be for a ſeaſon ſome particular exceptions, but they admit of an eaſy remedy. In ſuch a government, I expect to find the poor virtuous and happy.—Waving, therefore, every conſideration of an opinion on government, merely as a matter of ſpeculation, I would wiſh the friends of liberty to conſider the importance of a reform in parliament, in reference to the police. There is, if I may ſo expreſs myſelf, a ſympathy in a government, where all the people have a ſhare in making the laws, either by themſelves or their repreſentatives. Men feel themſelves fellow-citizens. The rich and the poor have one intereſt.

I have often reflected, with a degree of pleaſure, on the conduct of the ancient Athenians, in what related to the general aſſembly of the people. They had not the advantage of repreſentation; they were, however, the freeſt ſtate of antiquity; in the earlier part of their hiſtory, if what an ancient writer ſays be true, even the women had a vote in the public aſſembly:—In their aſſembly met all the citizens of Athens, that is, all but thoſe who were puniſhed with infamy, ſlaves, women, and children: and each man had a right of addreſſing his fellow-citizens *.—The practice of theſe aſſemblies was wiſe: they were of two kinds; the one met on ſtated days of their own accord; the other on urgent buſineſs, at the ſummons of the magiſtrate. So far from any of the citizens being excluded from theſe aſſemblies, they were even fined if they did not attend; and a premium was given out of the public exchequer to the poor, who paid an early and regular attendance.

England admires the writings of the ancient Athenians: but words are fleeting: it was love of freedom that taught Athens eloquence †. Is England an enlightened nation? Let her revere the ſpirit of Athens. The repreſentative government, if com-

* Demoſthenes. Κατὰ φιλίππου. † Longinus.

plete,

plete, would, in many reſpects, excel the government of Athens. But the greater part of the people of England are not repreſented. This is the BURDEN of my complaint. Whatever my opinion were on forms of government, I ſhould reſpect that form in any country, which the national will decreed: but in a caſe, where the majority has no ſhare in making the laws, though I am willing to obey the laws, Can I reſpect the government? Give me my rights, and, in return, you ſhall have my reſpect. But do not think me either fool or knave.

It has frequently been obſerved, that in the ſaxon times, all who paid ſcot and lot had a vote in framing the laws. To what extent this policy extended, has been diſputed by many; but it ſeems highly probable, from the great concourſe of people who aſſembled, and from the terms in which thoſe aſſemblies were deſcribed, that none were, at leaſt, excluded from attendance *.

Whether it be the opinion of certain gentlemen, that the people of England have no right to a free and adequate repreſentation in parliament; or whether it be their opinion that the time for diſcuſſing the queſtion is not yet come, I will not determine.

But, Is it not a ſubject of juſt complaint, for I cannot help touching on this ſubject, that in thoſe inſtances, in which honeſt men have, in a peaceable and orderly manner aſſembled to diſcuſs theſe matters, they ſhould have been interrupted and *perſecuted*? That ſome ſhould have had their houſes aſſaulted, and their perſons endangered? Some forced to leave their families, and to relinquiſh their employments; others caſhiered without a trial, and rejected from poſts in which their conduct had been honourable? Is this juſt? Is it agreeable to the cuſtoms of a free people? Is it dignified and manly? Is it *conſtitutional*?—Every ſubject of Britain is both authorized and encouraged by the *genius of engliſh liberty* to examine the errors of the conſtitution, and the defects of adminiſtration: and if they ſhew no reſiſtance to the law, ought to be under its protection. A *right to petition* and to *remonſtrate*, which, we ſay, is the engliſhman's *birthright*, would be nugatory, if there were no right to aſſemble. It was a law of Solon's, that, Whoever ſtood neuter in a time of ſedition, ſhould be convicted of infamy: and ſhall it be ſaid, that in England, even in a time of peace†, men ſhall be convicted of infamy, who aſſemble to examine a political queſtion?

As to the means which have been taken to ſuppreſs theſe aſſociations, firſt, by proclamations, and ſince by counter-aſſociations, I repeat what I have ſaid before; the proclamations were

* Spelman's Concil. Britan. Wilkins' Leges Anglo-Sax. and Millar on the Eng. Government.

† This was written before the declaration of war by France.

not laws: they were never ratified by parliament. As to the counter-associations, I venture to pronounce them unconſtitutional, taking as we are wont to do, the bill of rights as the ground of reaſoning. Mr. Erſkine, in his addreſs at the Freemaſon's tavern, has obſerved in what manner they oppoſe the cuſtoms of this country, by making voluntary aſſociations of individuals proſecutors, inſtead of the ſupreme executive power: and by the bill of rights (ch. 29.) it is declared, "That no freeman may be *apprehended*, or *impriſoned*, or diſſeiſed of his freehold, or liberties, or free cuſtoms, or be outlawed, or baniſhed, or anywiſe deſtroyed; nor will we PASS upon him, nor CONDEMN him, but by the *lawful* judgment of *his peers*, or by the law of the land." But in the caſe before us, the juſtices of the quarter-ſeſſions, and the jury, are aſſociators; and either they, or the informers, whom they have encouraged, who are alſo aſſociators, are the accuſers: theſe, too, are the men who *paſs* over us, and *condemn us*. Is this the LAW of the LAND?

Theſe aſſociations are unnatural. We do not merely view citizen againſt citizen, father againſt ſon, and ſon againſt father, but man againſt HIMSELF. For of whom are theſe aſſociations compoſed? In looking over ſome of their liſts, I ſee many men, who have actually aſſociated on the other ſide, and men now united againſt ſeditious writings, who have themſelves been promoters of writings reputed ſeditious.

The influence which theſe gentlemen have (for they have got MONEY) in having writings either PROSECUTED, or CONCEALED, or PRESCRIBED, is worthy of attention. Some bookſellers are not ſafe, others are their humble ſervants; as are alſo a ſwarm of hireling and paltry ſcribblers, who are any man's friends, or any man's enemies, from motives of ſelf-intereſt, of malice, or of reſentment; while men, whoſe talents and whoſe labours have a tendency to public utility, are brought under unjuſt imputations, that themſelves may be made the heroes of a tale: and, as good examples ought always to be imitated, this ſpirit paſſes over to other gentlemen, who have not aſſociated: kind and liberal gentlemen, who firſt kiſs, and then kill; who oppoſe the exertions of diſintereſted benevolence, to gratify ſome mean, or ſome violent paſſion, or to comply with the wiſhes of others!

As to the characters of ſome of thoſe who have taken a lead in forming theſe aſſociations, it cannot be denied, that they have acted under a *certain influence*, that blinds the wiſe as well as the fooliſh, or have been impelled by fears, which over-rule the ſtrong as well as the weak.

Yet, after all the exertions that have been made, theſe aſſociations wear no ſuch formidable appearance. Even in London, the

the ſignatures were proportionably ſmall, conſidering London comprehends ſix hundred thouſand inhabitants; without taking notice, that many, who ſubſcribed, had no will of their own, ſuch as clerks in public offices, &c. &c. maſters and ſervants of coffee-houſes, taverns, &c. &c. In ſo large a city as Norwich, there could only be procured three hundred ſubſcribers, while the *voluntary* aſſociations for a *reform* in parliament conſiſt, even now, of ſome thouſands.

The oſtenſible object, however, of theſe aſſociations is, I confeſs, honourable.—They profeſs to have in view the protection of liberty and property, and to ſecure the peaceful ſubject againſt the ſeditious. But theſe declarations imply, that there are men, or ſocieties of men, whoſe object was to invade liberty and property, and to oppoſe the execution of the laws. Where then are theſe men? Where theſe ſocieties?—Before theſe counter-aſſociations were formed, I attended ſeveral of the ſocieties; I have almoſt conſtantly attended one of their committees, formed of delegates from various ſocieties; I paid a minute attention to their proceedings; I have heard letters, and reſolutions read from various ſocieties in England and Scotland; and having a particular object in view, procured copies of as many of them as I could. I was rather an obſerver at theſe meetings, than an actor in them; and, as a man of honour, I declare, that no one of theſe ſocieties was formed on thoſe principles, or with thoſe views, which the aſſociators hold forth. The ſecretary of the committee alluded to, publiſhed a "Plan for an Equal Repreſentation in Parliament;" which he begins thus:—"That life, liberty, and property, are better protected in Great Britain than elſewhere, is a ſophiſtry that has long deluded the honeſt heart. We have nothing to do with, how they are protected in other countries. The queſtion is, Are life, liberty, and property, as well protected in this country as they ought to be?"—The only object of this plan was a reform in the repreſentation of the commons of Great Britain.

In forming ſome of thoſe ſocieties, in which major Cartwright and lord Daer took the principal lead, thoſe gentlemen, I remember, were particularly exact on the article of liberty and property. A letter from captain Johnſon, who, if I recollect, was chairman of ſimilar ſocieties in Scotland, was addreſſed to Mr. Favell, the chairman, or Mr. Scheiffer, the ſecretary of ſome political ſocieties in London; in this letter, captain Johnſon ſtated his own wiſhes and ſentiments relative to a parliamentary reform; which, as it was written without any view to publication, and was, I believe, never publiſhed, may be ſuppoſed to have been written without reſerve: it contains principles, which muſt not only have appeared moderate and reaſonable to one of my ſentiments,

but muſt have appeared ſo to all, except thoſe who think a parliamentary reform unreaſonable. The ſame remarks I could make on various communications from other ſimilar ſocieties.

The addreſs to the nation from the London Correſponding Society for example, lately delivered, June 8, 1793, is on the ſubject of a *thorough parliamentary reform*, ſtated thus in their firſt reſolution: Reſolved, "That nothing, but a fair, adequate, and annually renovated repreſentation in parliament, can enſure the freedom of this country." And at the cloſe of the addreſs, they ſpeak of redoubling their exertions in the cauſe of *Conſtitutional freedom*.

To ſpeak my mind freely, I can by no means think thoſe gentlemen to have been in earneſt, who charge theſe ſocieties with either direct or indirect deſigns on property: for though the perſons who compoſed them held no places, and received no penſions, they were, many of them, men of conſiderable property, and had an equal intereſt in its ſecurity with themſelves. When a man aſſerts, he has a right to be repreſented in parliament, does he mean to ſay, "Gentlemen, I have a right to put my hand into your pockets?" No. He means to ſay, "Gentlemen, you have no right to put your hand into MY pocket without MY leave."

As to the objections, made againſt theſe ſocieties, on the ground that they approved the writings of Mr. Paine, and the revolution in France, they can only apply to a certain extent, and even ſo far as they do apply, they are not difficult to anſwer. That many individuals, and probably ſome ſocieties, approved the 'Rights of Man,' is admitted. With reſpect to individuals, their opinions were thoſe of individuals, for which whole ſocieties were not reſponſible: and even if ſome whole ſocieties approved thoſe principles, many others openly diſclaimed them, particularly one of the ſocieties called *Friends of the People*. The Conſtitutional Society in London, the Norwich, and the Sheffield Societies, have uniformly declared for a parliamentary reform; and the Hertfordſhire Society muſt appear moderate, even in the judgment of their opponents. Differing with reſpect to the time, the means, and the perſons, for effecting it, the point where theſe reſpectable ſocieties all met was, that a parliamentary reform was expedient; and the wiſdom and juſtice of this meaſure ſtand independent of the approbation or diſapprobation of any recent publications. If Mr. Paine had never written, the people of England have a right to a fair and equal repreſentation: and now Mr. Paine's book is pronounced a libel, the right is the ſame; the juſtice of aſſerting it, and the wiſdom of conceding it, are unalterable.

As to the approbation of the French revolution, which ſome of theſe ſocieties expreſſed, here was alſo a diverſity of opinion:

not

not as to the event; for the opinion, that the french revolution involved in it the deareſt intereſts of juſtice, mercy, truth, and happineſs, was uniform: here, indeed, every britiſh heart had a common feeling! But as to particular meaſures, and the perſons who adopted them; to contingencies, that were wholly unforeſeen; and to diſorders, on which there could be no reckoning; here, again, there exiſted great diverſity of opinion. The friends of liberty approved and diſapproved; they rejoiced, and they wept. In the midſt of an event new in the hiſtory of the world, and attended with circumſtances correſponding to ſuch an event, they were divided, perplexed, confounded: always diſpoſed to rejoice at the conqueſts of liberty, yet frequently miſtaking, amidſt the number, the ſuddenneſs, and the embaraſſment of events, the tendency both of defeats and of conqueſts.

The national aſſembly of France invited people of all nations to give their advice in matters relative to their new conſtitution: and there have been ſeveral addreſſes to the convention, and patriotic ſocieties in France from engliſhmen, who have preſented advice on that important ſubject. I have read ſeveral of them. That which was written in the freeſt manner of cenſure on the conſtituent aſſembly of France, and the engliſh government, was written by an engliſh gentleman, who was, I believe, a member of no political ſociety whatever in England*: and this, I believe, is true of ſeveral addreſſes that have been received by the patriotic ſocieties, and the members of the national convention.

For my own part, I own, in no period of my life have I felt ſtronger paſſions, or purer motives. On the ſpur of ſuch an important event, I experienced energies and exertions by no means congenial to my ſettled habits of retirement. Yes! with a few exceptions, I approved, and ſtill approve the doctrine of the Rights of Man; and the french revolution I contemplated, and ſtill contemplate, as the moſt important æra in the hiſtory of NATIONS.—But becauſe men rejoiced to ſee ſo many millions of people enſlaved ſtruggling for liberty, does it follow, that they are enemies to their country? Benevolence is of no party, of no country: attached to human beings, and the cauſe of humanity, ſhe wiſhes all mankind to be happy, and all governments to be juſt. I beg pardon for going thus out of the way to ſpeak on this ſubject; but thus far I go, not merely to vindicate my own conduct, but that of thouſands throughout the kingdom,

* This ſpirited little work is entitled, "An Addreſs to the Jacobin and other patriotic Societies of the French, urging the Eſtabliſhment of a Republican Form of Government. By a Native of England, and a Citizen of the World, 1792."—It was not publiſhed in England, though I have been favoured with a printed engliſh copy of it by a friend.

who have acted, I am perſuaded, in ſimilar caſes, on the moſt honourable and diſintereſted principles.

But to return.—Though it may not be improper to intimate, that gentlemen, who aſſociate on principles deſtructive of the liberty of engliſhmen, will not be able to prevent men from meeting, who are true friends to liberty; though it may not, I ſay, be improper to intimate this, yet thoſe who have aſſociated ſhould be reminded, at the ſame time, of the grounds of their aſſociations. Ye have aſſociated, gentlemen, as *Friends to Liberty and property*. To be conſiſtent, then, ye muſt be friends to a reform in parliament. Prove, that ye equal thoſe in zeal, whom ye have equalled, at leaſt, in prudence. Prove that, by your attempt to take *reforming principles* out of the hands of *dangerous* men, that ye are, yourſelves, men in whom the public can confide. If, on the other hand, while ye challenge the character of friends to liberty and property, ye are in fact combined againſt a reform in parliament, which alone can ſecure them, as it has been hinted ſome of you are, or, if yielding to ſome partial expedient, ye reſt ſhort of a fair and equal repreſentation, the real friends of liberty will find it difficult to think you ſincere. They will ſay, that *ye* only act a *ſecond* part; that the *great* actors are not *ſeen*. They will ſay of you, Ye have deſpiſed the poor, and mean to deſpiſe them; and the friends of liberty throughout the world will call you traitors to the liberties of your country; they will ſay, BRITAIN is ENSLAVED by FRIENDS to LIBERTY and PROPERTY.

Some time ſince, when a reform in parliament was urged, it was ſaid, "This is not the time." Why? France was then agitated with ſtorms, and England enjoyed a calm. Why, then, interrupt this calm by political diſcuſſions? The politics of France may be introduced into England.—The miniſter told us, we had a proſpect of peace for fifteen years to come; that our finances were in the moſt flouriſhing ſtate; that our manufactures were enriching the nation. With reſpect to the public revenue, indeed, it has been ſhewn by a well-informed writer*, that ſo far from our income exceeding our expenditure by a million annually, as the miniſter ſaid, our expenditure has exceeded our income by a greater ſum. However, theſe declarations were held forth; and if they had been true, it was certainly the proper time for a reform: if the nation had been in a ſtate of proſperity, this would have rendered their happineſs more complete; and ſo far from interrupting the proſpect of peace, it would, I am fully perſuaded, have thrown back every probability of a war. Now, indeed, we are obliged to change our ground.—Since affairs, by the evil policy of adminiſtration, have worn an aſpect towards

* Morgan's Review of the Life and Writings of Dr. Price.

war,

war*, we are finding arguments from that quarter. "To urge a reform of parliament in England," ſay ſome, "when we are diſcuſſing the queſtion of a war with France, is diſcuſſing two queſtions at once, which ought, on every ground of prudence, to undergo ſeparate diſcuſſions." But here, again, I am unfortunate enough to ſee no force in the objection. If it was improper to diſcuſs this queſtion a year ago, becauſe things were then in a ſtate of quiet, there can be no impropriety, I ſhould think, in diſcuſſing it now, on account of the preſent war.—In ſhort, a time of war and a time of peace both furniſh their ſeparate arguments in favour of the diſcuſſion. A time of peace and proſperity is favourable to it, as it affords leiſure for cool and diſpaſſionate deliberation; and, in a caſe of preparation for war, a diſcuſſion of it is proper, becauſe the public mind ſhould be known as to the expediency of ſuch a war; becauſe the people muſt be taxed, to carry it on; and becauſe, in the caſe of a war, a nation ought to feel one ſpirit, to act from one motive. A people never judge more properly on a war, than when they *tax* THEMSELVES to ſupport it; never fight more courageouſly, nor triumph more certainly, than when they are not barely told, they are free, but when they feel themſelves ſo. Some of the moſt extraordinary conqueſts of the heroes of antiquity were gained under ſuch circumſtances; and thus in modern times the moſt arduous enterprizes have been undertaken with the greateſt ſucceſs. In no period of our hiſtory were political matters diſcuſſed more thoroughly, than during the commonwealth; yet at no period were our arms more ſucceſsful nor our power more dreaded by foreign nations.—During that period, the greateſt internal commotions were ſuppreſſed, and all the powers of Europe courted the alliance of Britain†. From the time of the declaration of independence, when the Americans were making warlike preparations, under many apparent diſadvantages, to reſiſt the claims of Britain, they were employed in new-modelling the whole government‡: and, during the progreſs of the revolution in France, new political arrangements, new laws, a new police, —in ſhort a new government has been formed.

An ancient writer obſerves, that internal ſedition hurts both parties; for it brings equal ruin on the conquerors and the conquered§. This is true, when people unite againſt the liberties of their country. As ſocieties, no leſs than individuals, ſometimes act wrong, and think right,—ſo alſo they may ſometimes act right, and thing wrong. Societies, alſo, may ſo far overact their parts, and may be compoſed of perſons of ſuch oppoſite

* This was written before the war with France.
† Hume's Hiſt. of England. ‡ Ramſay's Hiſt. of America.
§ Democritus apud Stobæum.

characters and views; principles favourable to truth and liberty, adopted by one part of a ſociety, may ſo weaken or over-rule oppoſite principles adopted by another, that even good conſequences may follow proceedings, from whence we might have expected nothing but evil. In all my political and religious purſuits, I am ſo accuſtomed to act from the belief of a ſupreme Being, and to reſolve every thing into his will and energy, that I feel no difficulty in ſaying, in every perplexity, All is well.

The aſſociation in London that took the lead of the others, and gave a direction to many of their proceedings, has certainly, to ſay the leaſt, overacted its part, by giving countenance to virulent publications, full of miſrepreſentations and falſehoods, and by encouraging the mean practices of ſecret and anonymous informers, in a way that would have diſgraced even a high commiſſion court and ſtar-chamber. Since the honeſt proceedings of one of their members, Mr. Law, the credit of this ſociety has declined, and the expulſion of that gentleman will not probably raiſe it. In like manner, the aſſociation of ſome diſſenting miniſters, when they brought forward a declaration, expreſſing a VENERATION for our EXCELLENT government, will be ſaid to have overacted its part, and not only to have juſtified the abſence of ſome of the moſt reſpectable miniſters, as well as the warm oppoſition of others, but to have prepared the way for the return of the true principles of a diſſenter, viz. that all civil inſtitutions in religion are imperfect; that the engliſh conſtitution, like other conſtitutions, has blemiſhes and ſome corruptions peculiar to itſelf: that the only way to rectify preſent evils, and to provide againſt greater, is to put a nation into poſſeſſion of their juſt rights; that a parliamentary reform is juſt in itſelf; that it is at all times honourable to urge it, and that even public calamities demand it.—For my own part, to no propoſition do I more heartily ſubſcribe, and in its fulleſt extent, than to that delivered in the houſe of commons, by one of its moſt diſtinguiſhed ornaments, Mr. Fox, "That a time of danger is a time for reform."

As I have been juſt ſpeaking of the diſſenters, I cannot help dropping a hint relative to a ſubject, on which I have delivered my free ſentiments elſewhere. Every friend to humanity, to virtue, and to literature, muſt unite in the wiſh, that the liberality of Dr. Prieſtley's private friends may be beforehand with the juſtice of his townſmen, and of his country. But I am informed, that Dr. Prieſtley has received, as yet, no reparation of his loſſes, from the quarter from whence it ought long ſince to have been made, I mean either from his townſmen or from government.

On urging the complaints of the poor people of England, and the expediency of a parliamentary reform, I may, perhaps, be thought

thought to have ſhewn prudence, in taking no notice of the conduct of the miniſter; or may even be ſuppoſed to reſpect it, on account of the meaſures which he has purſued relative to our finances, his ſyſtem of arranging the taxes, of ſimplifying the cuſtoms, of checking ſmuggling, and of increaſing the revenue. Of prudence I profeſs to have no immoderate ſhare; but from the praiſe which is really the miniſter's due, I am not willing to take the ſmalleſt portion. May my maxim ever be, 'Honour to whom honour is due!' But even this reminds me, that great part of the praiſe, which has been reaped by Mr. Pitt, was really earned by Dr. Price; and that great part of our proſperity has proceeded, not from the ſuperior wiſdom of miniſters, but from circumſtances rather flattering than permanent, and even from the calamities of Europe. If the praiſe, that is due to Mr. Pitt, is to be taken with theſe abatements, the cenſure which he has merited is of a more poſitive nature. I ſhall here borrow the words of a writer, who is himſelf an able financier, and whoſe obſervations are alſo grounded on the diſquiſitions of the late Dr. Price, improved by his own*.

"But it will appear from the following work, that there are other parts of his adminiſtration which ought never to be regarded in the ſame favourable light. The public income, which is repreſented to have been ſo productive as to exceed the expenditure annually by a million, has conſtantly proved deficient by a larger ſum: no real progreſs has hitherto been made in extinguiſhing the debt; and the act which was eſtabliſhed for the purpoſe, after having been rendered weak and ineffectual by injudicious clauſes and reſtrictions, has not been aſſiſted, ſo far as it might and ought to have been, by the preſent ſituation of the public funds. If the national debt be an evil, and few will deny this to be the caſe, we ought to avail ourſelves of every circumſtance, which can haſten the extinction of it. But can the meaſures which are now purſuing be ſaid to have any ſuch tendency?—Inſtead of appropriating the whole ſurplus of the revenue in future, if there ſhould be any, in quickening the operations of the ſinking fund, the ſum of 150,000l. is to be given up from the public income for the ſake only of aboliſhing a few inſignificant taxes, and we are to be amuſed with the vain idea of preventing the further extenſion of the debt, by impoſing laws on poſterity, without the power of enforcing their execution, or even poſſeſſing ſufficient power to make them the rule of our own conduct."

We have already exceeded five times the ſum, at which, when the national debt ſhould arrive, it was predicted that there muſt inevitably be a national bankruptcy. What approach we are

* Morgan's Review of Price's Writings on the Finances of this Kingdom.

making to that ſtate now, I will not aſſert; but certain it is, that, be the reſources of a country ever ſo great; be the commercial ſpirit ever ſo active; be the ſituation of other countries ever ſo diſtreſſing,—there is a point, beyond which public credit cannot ſtand. While a public burden is increaſing, a nation ſhould, at leaſt, be thoughtful; for, though the evil day may be put off, if prudence, wiſdom, juſtice, and mercy, do not teach certain perſons a better ſyſtem of financiering, IT MUST ARRIVE. The price of the funds is a very dangerous rule, by which to eſtimate public proſperity. It is well known, that at this inſtant there is a great ſcarcity of money in England, and the means that have been taken, for ſome years, to diminiſh this evil, is every day increaſing it; I mean the immoderate increaſe of country bankers. We may, indeed, extend the exciſe laws: but in what manner this may diminiſh our manufactures, interrupt commerce, and, at the ſame time, even defeat its own object in the article of revenue, may be learned by the law which brought tobacco under the exciſe*. We may alſo lay on freſh taxes, or collect the old ones with greater ſeverity; or, to cloſe the whole, we may, to prevent an inquiry into grievances, involve the NATION IN A WAR. But will this pay the national debt? will the introduction of new calamities remove the effect of paſt? Gracious heaven! will it not, muſt it not, increaſe them? Already are we experiencing the truth of this remark. It has been ſaid, "that another war will probably decide the queſtion, relative to the reſources of this country." The american added one hundred and twenty millions to the national debt! Under theſe circumſtances, whether thoſe who were among the firſt to urge a reform of parliament, and among the firſt to oppoſe it, are to be conſidered among the friends or the enemies to this country, is a queſtion which ſome future day will decide.

On the real authors of the preſent war, its true grounds, and its probable conſequences, whatever my private opinion may be, I ſay NOTHING. May national calamities produce national reformation! And ſhould an evil day arrive, may it be remembered that the friends to a reform, were enemies to the war!

Are there legiſlators, who think that the PEOPLE have rights, which it is dangerous for the PEOPLE to urge; that there may be grounds of complaint, though the PEOPLE ought not to complain; that POOR PERSONS who have no ſhare in repreſentation, and reformers who are out of office, are clamorous, when they ought to be patient; oſtentatious, when they ought to be ſilent; and ambitious, when they ought to be reſerved? Are there, I aſk, ſuch legiſlators? and would they yet be addreſſed as friends to

* See a courſe of Letters, publiſhed in the Patriot and General Advertiſer.

liberty? I know they would.—Liberty is the AVOWED PRINCIPLE of every Engliſhman. Let ſuch legiſlators, then, venerate their own characters. If the PEOPLE, in purſuing their rights, muſt not lead, may legiſlators, in promoting their juſt wiſhes, condeſcend to guide them; and in the wiſdom and juſtice of their meaſures, as well as in the impartiality of their regards, may they merit the appellation of SENATORS and of PATRIOTS. A NATION is rarely ungrateful; and POSTERITY, when it records good deeds, will forgive every thing but villany, and, with a tear, blot out human frailties from her book of remembrance for ever.

Ye patriots of Ireland, warm with the ſpirit of liberty, and willing that even the nation ſhould ſhare it, let me pay you, as I paſs, a tribute of reſpect: let me hope that your patriotiſm is affectionate and ſincere; and that your exertions will be lively and perſevering. May your ſpirit too be caught by engliſh ſenators! May I live to ſee the day when an engliſh parliament ſhall ariſe, and, as with one voice, ſay, "Ye people of England, whoſe repreſentatives we are, to your ſervice we devote our talents. Your will ſhall be our law; your intereſt our happineſs. Thoſe rights, which ye poſſeſs we will labour to ſecure; and thoſe which ye ought to poſſeſs, we, as your guardians, will ſtudy to obtain for you. We will unite with you in the great cauſe of liberty! a cauſe, which, though often diſgraced by bad, and oftener miſrepreſented by deſigning men, has for its objects univerſal truth, univerſal virtue, univerſal happineſs!

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The Balance of Opinions on the Subject of Reform.

THERE are periods when ſchemes of reformation are rendered unpopular, on account of the difficulties and evil conſequences ſuppoſed to attend them. With reſpect to the difficulties, it muſt be acknowledged, that few exertions towards improvement are without them. When ſociety is degenerating, its movements, like that of a ſtone down a hill, is eaſy and rapid; but as it verges towards reform, the motion is up an aſcent. This requires labour and patience. To ſay, however, that evil conſequences may attend reformation, is entirely to miſtake the term: for reformation is not alteration merely, and leſs ſtill is it alteration for the worſe; it is alteration for the better.

I ſhall here preſent the reader with three plans of reform: not that I ſuppoſe any one of them is likely to be realized; not that they will receive any importance from the character of the perſon who delineates them. I am merely a ſpeculatiſt; but my ſpeculations originate not in the love of diſorder: they proceed from no malevolence. I love the calm of life, and ſhudder at a ſtorm.

The firſt plan of reform would leave the ſtate of repreſentation, and the form of government by king, lords, and commons, without the leaſt alteration. The object of this plan would be merely the police.

Mirabeau, in his "Lettres de Cachet," has occaſion to ſpeak of inſtances, wherein a government may be bad, and the police, in many reſpects, good; or wherein a government may have had many of its original principles over-ruled or evaded, and yet retain many proviſions for ſecurity and confidence. This he exemplifies by the ſtates of Holland. I do not here ſay, that any government is bad; leſs ſtill, that the engliſh government is. My argument does not require it. I only ſay, that a government, be it what it may, may keep its place, though the police ſhould not. I go further; a government, that is not the beſt, may gain ſtrength, by improving the police.

Many of my ſubjects of complaint are caſes of eaſy remedy, and lie on the ſurface of obſervation. They involve no political diſcuſſion: they require no profound ſpeculation: they are connected with no hazardous experiment: but they are important; they involve the happineſs of individuals, the comfort of poor families, and, in ſome caſes, of the rich; the caſes of ſuch, whom even

even the eye of pity only views at a diſtance, and of whom the philanthropiſt only hears by report; the miſeries of many perſons, unfortunate perhaps, rather than vicious; or if vicious, yet not abandoned; perſons whom, in many caſes, proper diſcipline might ſave from vice, and proper treatment redeem from the grave: ſubjects, which, though I am not diſpoſed to give an importance to my inquiries, relate to the virtue, the happineſs of thouſands. I do not profeſs to have treated theſe ſubjects at large; but they deſerve to be ſo treated. They deſerve more; they deſerve to be ſeen in practice. I have only dropped hints; hints, however, that are capable of improvement: and if any reader have gone thus far in hearing my complaints, and, in thoſe inſtances wherein they are juſt, feel no ſympathy; and, ſo far as he has influence, make no effort to redreſs them, he is a reader, for whoſe ſake I am not writing.

Our law-proceedings, and the cuſtoms of our courts, are to be conſidered among the public evils that call for reform: yet, though theſe evils lie deep, they might be remedied, without altering our form of government. When the eye of inquiry once dwells on this ſubject, it will ſee more defects, than can be diſcovered by a haſty glance. It is not of late years only, that the imperfections of our ſtatute book, and the cuſtoms of the law, have been pointed out: I ſay more; even in a book of conſiderable authority on the laws, written in Edw. Iſt's reign, may be ſeen "The Defects of the great Charter*." Of late years, great blemiſhes in ſome of the principles of our laws, and the practices of our courts, have been pointed out by profeſſional men†: and a ſenſible writer, who approves our preſent form of government‡, and from whom, on political ſubjects, I in many reſpects differ, has, on our civil and criminal code, been brought to the ſame concluſion. This is the FIRST PLAN.

The ſecond would comprehend a reform of parliament, including a fair and equal repreſentation; yet without any alteration in the form of our government. The right which the people have to urge the claim, and the wiſdom which the legiſlature would ſhew in uniting to liſten to it, I ſhall not at preſent diſcuſs; nor will I point out its advantages: theſe, indeed, I have already ſhewn. But this I inſiſt on, and I muſt repeat it, that an alteration might be made for the better, and yet the form of government continue. I have elſewhere ſhewn§, that in the very

* Mirror of Juſtices.

† The honourable Daines Barrington on the Statutes; Mr. Scheiffer on the Practice of the Law; and Mr. Randal, in a ſenſible work entitled "Juridical Eſſays."

‡ Dr. Gregory's Eſſays.

§ Inquiry into the Nature of Subſcription, part iii. chap. 1, 2, 9.

early

early periods of our hiſtory, our anceſtors held principles favourable to liberty: and I am pleaſed by ſince finding that I have the authority of ſir John Sinclair, in his "Hiſtory of the Revenue," &c. in ſupport of an inaccuracy that I noted in ſir Henry Spelman. I have, at the ſame time, taken ſome pains to ſhew, that many of our engliſh writers have fixed the boundaries of political liberty among our ſaxon anceſtors, with ſome degree of inaccuracy. The truth ſeems to be, that they had no houſe of repreſentatives, properly ſo called, and that none but free tenants had any perſonal concern in legiſlation *.

The form of our government, however, was monarchial. The form of our government was more monarchial ſtill, after the conqueſt; and might continue monarchial, though the people's ſhare in legiſlation was rendered more complete, than in either of thoſe periods; for the monarchial government exiſted, when it had leſs power; it exiſted, when it had leſs influence. It might exiſt, it has been ſaid, it will exiſt, with more; it may exiſt, it is hoped, it will exiſt, with leſs.

This plan would have for its object, not only a fair and equal repreſentation in parliament; it would alſo have a ſhorter duration. If I were to go profeſſedly into the ſubject, I ſhould have nothing to add to what the duke of Richmond and Dr. Jebb have ſuggeſted †. My argument, too, for every perſon having a ſhare in repreſentation, except idiots, inſane perſons, and children, I ſhould derive from no local character. In whatever country a perſon is born; whether he be an engliſhman or an hottentot; if, as a member of civil ſociety, he be ſubject to government, he ought to have a ſhare in making the laws. The difficulty of realizing this plan would vaniſh in the experiment. With reſpect to the objection, ariſing from the incapacity of the lower ranks of people, this would be entirely ſuperſeded by primary aſſemblies. I paſs it by, in compliment to the reader's underſtanding.

This plan might comprehend every thing that was valuable in the firſt. It would alſo comprehend many improvements, for which the firſt plan could not provide; ſuch as the abolition of uſeleſs places and penſions; a better ſyſtem for the management of the finances; a ſurer and more expeditious mean of paying off the national debt; an equalization of church livings; the abolition of teſts in our univerſities, and for civil employments in the ſtate:—in ſhort, every thing that a reflecting nation ſhould think deſerving reform.

But here lies the great objection: Reformers are levellers,

* Spelman's Gloſſary, and Clark's Connection of Roman, Saxon, and Engliſh Coins.

† Letters addreſſed to the Volunteers of Ireland, in Dr. Jebb's Works.

They

They would reduce the ſalary of a biſhop, who enjoys ten thouſand pounds a year, to that of a country rector; and ſinecure places and penſions they would wipe entirely away. But this is talking too faſt. This plan would not go to deprive any incumbent of his benefice; it would only provide, that when the incumbent died, the ſalary ſhould be diſpoſed of to better advantage. The ſame alſo of ſinecure places. Penſions, to a reaſonable amount, for ſervices done, and under the direction of a power, that *could not corrupt*, might exiſt. And this is the SECOND PLAN.

On the means of effecting this reform, whether by a national convention, or by the people's repreſentatives in parliament, I ſay nothing. If the point be effectually gained, no friend to his country will have reaſon to complain of the means.

The third plan ſuppoſes an alteration in the form of government. I obtrude no term of approbation or diſapprobation on this plan. The reader will here pleaſe to hold the balance himſelf, and to throw his judgment in which ſcale he pleaſes. I ſhall, however, venture to deliver an opinion, which is, I know, pretty generally denied, viz. that an alteration may even be made in a form of government, without thoſe convulſions which uſually attend it.

Though it is my opinion, that a minority, and even an individual, has a right to publiſh his opinion on forms of government, even on the avowed principles of the britiſh conſtitution; that they have alſo a right to aſſemble, to examine, to ſtate grievances, to claim redreſs; and alſo that where this minority or this individual, are reſtrained from voting, the right rather increaſes, than diminiſhes; though theſe, I ſay, are my opinions, yet I at the ſame time maintain, that a body of delegates only, repreſenting the nation, has a right to alter a government, forming the boundaries of a conſtitution by a majority. To an exiſting government a minority is bound to ſubmit. They may reaſon; they may *oppoſe* by *arguments*; but no farther. They ought to obey the laws: much more ought an individual. Theſe remarks I make, to prevent the miſapplication of certain principles; and the following I drop, to ſhew, that a perſon may hold a particular form of government in no extraordinary eſtimation, and yet indulge no malevolent wiſhes towards any individual living under it.

A government might be ſo altered, that a ſtanding army ſhould no longer exiſt.—This would be no loſs to the common ſoldiers: they have *nothing* to loſe. The officers might continue to receive their ſalaries for life, or be allowed to ſell their commiſſions, or, more properly, perhaps, reſign them to government, receiving a proper compenſation. In a government, where commiſſions are purchaſed, this is but juſtice; and even where commiſſions are not purchaſed, if a man has been trained to a profeſſion, authorized

rized by an exiſting government, he ſhould be indemnified. He has committed no crime by being a ſoldier, and he ſhould not be treated as a malefactor: it is not neceſſary. It is, however, not neceſſary that the ſame ſyſtem ſhould continue, in order to ſecure the comfort of exiſting individuals.

The law might be ſimplified; the proceedings of our courts might be ſhortened, and the proceedings be made cheaper, without ſinking either the dignity, or, in the end, the profits of the profeſſion *.—In a government where even the profeſſion ſhould be overwhelmed, and even degraded by 30,000 perſons engaged in it, it might not be neceſſary, that even a ſingle attorney of the loweſt deſcription ſhould be forced to relinquiſh his employment. Things, however, might be put, under ſuch a government, in a better train for the future.—If it ſhould happen, that a judge or other officer ſhould have received too large a ſalary, it is not neceſſary that he ſhould be deprived of it. It is, however, by no means neceſſary that the ſame ſalary ſhould be aſſigned to his ſucceſſor.

Should it ſeem expedient to reform univerſities, and that even ſome of its finances, ſuch as church revenues, might better revert to the public purſe, no exiſting individual need be injured. In a government, where it had been the cuſtom to exclude whole bodies of men from partaking the advantages of univerſities, ſhould thoſe bodies be allowed to ſhare ſuch advantages, they would bring with them new revenues; and poſſeſſing great wealth, their gratitude and their zeal would awaken their liberality. Here, too, a reform need not take away one ſalary from any individual now exiſting; it might even make handſome proviſion for tutors, for profeſſors, in *real employment*, of the arts and ſciences; for men actually engaged in any literary labours, that benefit ſociety. Should there be, in ſuch univerſities, men receiving ſalaries, yet neither capable of inſtructing youth, nor of edifying the world, it might be ſaid to ſuch, "Sleep on *now*, and take your reſt." But need the next generation ſleep too? By no means. There is a ſpecies of ſleeping, that is catching. Men had better ſleep in an alms-houſe, than in a college.

Indeed, from the temper of the ſtudies purſued at Cambridge, as well as from a great degree of liberality poſſeſſed by many of its members, there were not wanting thoſe, who hoped a diſpoſition might prevail there, to rectify ſome of its more glaring impoſitions, begotten originally by tyranny, and nurſed by weakneſs. This they were led to hope: but they have in a great meaſure hoped in vain. And lately theſe ſame men have not

* See Scheiffer's Practice of the Law.

only

only been disappointed, but they have blushed, they have grieved. They have seen a plan for "peace and union" followed by violent fears, and a vigorous prosecution; and a person as much distinguished for his benevolence as his learning, expelled from the university of Cambridge * ! !—These are the signs of the times!

Suppose it should happen, in such a government, that the people should think they are capable of praying for themselves, and that they could find the way to their heavenly Father without a priest: there would be always a number of good people, who would choose an instructor, and who would love him. Piety and gratitude are just and liberal, and the preacher would neither sink into contempt nor beggary. Suppose, in such a state of things, government should no longer support the clergy; yet, if the people should, need the clergy be losers? The people would not give a clergyman ten thousand pounds a year; true: but from a clergyman who had been accustomed to receive ten thousand a year, they need not take a farthing. His successor, however, might be contented with less: if he did not receive the same homage, he would receive, if he deserved it, more esteem; and though he might not be surrounded with so much of the wealth and glory of this world, he might look more like a candidate for a better.

Independently of the support which many clergymen would receive from the voluntary contributions of worshippers, uniting in religious society, other resources might be recurred to, in the case here supposed.—I have already taken notice respecting England's defect in a provision for national education. I have taken notice, that in instances, wherein charity-schools may be supposed, in some measure, to have supplied this defect, their benefits are often lost. If a calculation were made of the sums annually paid for the support of these schools; if to this were added the sums necessary to complete a plan of national education, a very handsome provision might be made from these funds, for thousands of the persons, of whom I am now speaking. There are moreover in parishes certain employments, that relate to the settling of the concerns of the poor, such as assessments, and the like. To these also might be annexed reasonable profits. And I own I see nothing degrading in any of these employments. There appeared in the world, some years ago, a preacher, whose character is still revered by many. His favourite maxim was, "He that would be greatest amongst you, let him be your servant." The christian, who admires this particular trait in the character of him whom he calls Master, may see it illustrated to a great advantage, by a very learned christian writer †.

* See Mr. Frend's Peace and Union, and Trial, shortly to be published.

† Evidence of Christianity, &c. By Gilbert Wakefield, B. A. Second Edition.

Whether

Whether an order of nobles tend to exalt or degrade man, I determine not. I only ſuppoſe that a nation may be either ſo fooliſh, or ſo wiſe, as to apprehend the latter. What then? Becauſe men ſhould think they have found out that ſtars and garters, robes and mitres, have neither virtues nor charms in them, muſt they rob each other of their property, and cut one another's throats? Gentlemen, I ſee no neceſſity for this.

In the caſe here ſuppoſed, property ſhould be conſidered ſacred. A community would find its intereſt in ſo conceiving of property, except where a minority, or an individual, ſhould take up arms againſt a nation. Here a confiſcation of property might not only be juſt, but even neceſſary. Sinecure places and penſions, indeed, are not to be conſidered as property. But even here the rule of mercy might be applied to exiſting individuals, (as it was a few years ago, in a certain caſe in this country,) though the rule of prudence might be applied to poſterity. This would injure nobody.

The law of primogeniture ſeems to me to riſe out of no natural right: on the contrary, if traced to its ſource, it would be found to riſe out of this principle, power conſtitutes right; a baſe principle! The abolition of the law of primogeniture would, therefore, be no violation of property. Where there is no right, there is no loſs; but a right obtained, may be reckoned as gain.

In a calculation of loſs and gain, of happineſs and miſery, it might be thought no uſeleſs ſpeculation, to examine, how far a decreaſe of places and penſions might be ſupplied by reſpectable profeſſions; by profeſſions, that require, perhaps, no extraordinary application; but which awaken genius, benefit a ſtate, enrich families, and diſgrace no one.—Were the balance to be held fairly, it would, perhaps, be found, that gain and happineſs would preponderate.

The great difficulty in ſuch a ſtate of things, which I am now ſuppoſing, is, I know, ſaid to be the diſpoſal of the ſupreme magiſtrate. I am not here ſpeaking of any particular country. The place which I at preſent ſeem to inhabit is that, in which Plato is ſaid to have loſt himſelf.

This great difficulty ſeems to me to proceed, if I may be allowed to ſay ſo, from a partial view of the ſubject. Without the will of the majority, this ought never to be made a queſtion: and where the will of a majority is to be the rule, I own, I ſee but little difficulty in the queſtion. Where an hereditary character intervenes, it may, perhaps, be perplexed.

The regal ſtate of Rome ſubſiſted two hundred and forty-four years, from the building of the city, and was then changed for a form ſomewhat approaching to a republic. During this period,

the Romans had ſeven kings. It is worthy of obſervation, that, notwithſtanding the private intrigues by which the ſupreme power was ſometimes obtained, they were attended with little that could be called convulſive; in moſt caſes, I own, the people choſe the ſupreme magiſtrate, and their choice was confirmed by the ſenate. Even in the alteration of the form of their government, from regal to conſular, the nation was not convulſed *. In this caſe, indeed, it was neceſſary to have Tarquin and his family baniſhed; for Tarquin had been a tyrant. But the ſlight inſurrections were eaſily ſuppreſſed. Some of the moſt dreadful civil wars have been thoſe, the object of which has been not to change a form of government, but either to ſupport or to oppoſe ſome hereditary claim †. The hiſtory of our own country is fruitful of examples; as in the wars of the two houſes of York and Lancaſter; and in the periods between the reign of Charles the firſt, and the baniſhment of James the ſecond.

The caſe of Louis Capet of France appears to me an example that does not confine itſelf to a queſtion on the alteration of a form of government. When the conſtituent aſſembly of France ſettled the conſtitution, I foreſaw it muſt evidently produce a republic. The avowed object, however, of that conſtitution, was the continuation of the ancient form. And the fate of Louis is to be referred, not to an alteration of a form of government from a monarchy to a republic, but to the monarch's violation of a conſtitution.

The caſe of Staniſlaus of Poland is an example a little in point to the preſent queſtion. Poland afforded an example of an alteration of government agreeable to all parties, injurious to none. The form of government, I own, was preſerved, but a new direction was given to it. Every thing was conducted amicably, yet the change was ſo material, as to entitle it to the name of a REVOLUTION.

The caſe of Poland, though its progreſs towards happineſs has been interrupted by deſpots, ſhews, that great alterations may be made in governments with little inconvenience, indeed with great advantages. How far a nation, REALLY FREE, may improve in political knowledge; how far it may extend its capacity for promoting PUBLIC HAPPINESS, without encroaching on private, is the moſt important diſquiſition in the ſcience of politics. —The reader will recollect, I have been in Utopia, a country that allows the freeſt inquiry. If, on my return to my own country, I retain ſomewhat of platonic ſcepticiſm, ſome allowances will, I hope, be made.

* Livii Hiſt.

† See the illuſtrious Algernon Sidney's Treatiſe on government.

In the preſent conduct of the United States of America towards their preſident, we are taught, that wiſe and moderate conduct awakens attachment, and confirms authority. How far the policy of the Americans is worthy of praiſe in this reſpect, I do not inquire. But at the cloſe of the few years, for which general Waſhington was appointed preſident, the States have choſen him again, and he will, probably, be continued for life.

CHAP. III.

APPENDIX.

On the dearneſs of Proviſion; Price of Labour; War; the Regulation of Workhouſes, &c.

THE principal grievance of the poor people of England I did but glance at in the former edition of this work, I mean the high price of proviſion. I began therefore to conceive the intention of purſuing my complaints through a ſecond volume, having on a late pedeſtrian excurſion, through ſome of our principal corn counties, been induced to make ſome freſh obſervations, on looking into ſeveral workhouſes, and on converſing with various deſcriptions of poor labourers and farmers: but having already pledged myſelf to a work of ſome extent, and being engaged in a regular courſe of ſtudies, I muſt relinquiſh the undertaking (any farther than it can fall within the compaſs of the following pages), as being too intereſting and too extenſive.

If the price of labour roſe with the price of proviſion, the people would eventually, on this head, have no cauſe of complaint. But many perſons can look back with painful remembrance on the time when they could live for nearly half their preſent expence, as will appear from the following ſtatement:—Prior to the year 1756, wheat ſold at three ſhillings to three and ſixpence a buſhel; barley from eighteen pence to two and twenty, ſome indeed lower than eighteen; malt at two ſhillings and ſixpence; a cwt. of new milk cheeſe ſold at from twelve to fourteen ſhillings. About this time, cheeſe was almoſt the principal article of conſumption with the poor; but now it is a rare morſel of which they ſcarcely ever get any, it being in retail more than double, ſome ſorts even more than treble its former price. Butchers meat is nearly, if not quite double its former price: ſo that many poor men with families literally live for ſeveral months by bread alone. The above account of prices was taken from about the centre of England, by a perſon who had large dealings with farmers, prior to the year 1756*.

* See a pamphlet, entitled, Conſiderations on the High Price of Grain, by Catharine Phillips, 1792.

The

The average prices of corn, from the returns received in the week ending the 7th of September, 1793, were as follows:— At Northampton, which is, I think, about the middle of England, wheat was forty-ſeven ſhillings, barley thirty-ſix ſhillings, a quarter, by the ſtandard Wincheſter quarter of eight buſhels; the average of England and Wales for wheat, forty-nine ſhillings and ſeven-pence; for barley, thirty-ſix ſhillings and eleven-pence*. The average price of wheat is the loweſt, that was made from April 20, to September 14, 1793. And this, on an average, is about double the price it was in the year 1756. A conſiderable increaſe has alſo been made in the prices of ſeveral articles of clothing, and of food.

I refer to the year 1756, becauſe, prior to that period, this country enjoyed great plenty; but was ſuddenly reduced in conſequence of a very bad harveſt, after the moſt promiſing appearance of a good one: one great cauſe of the preſent high price of proviſion, being the failure of that year, which was attended with very ſerious conſequences.

Before the next harveſt, wheat was raiſed to treble the former price: the poor were ſometimes obliged to eat horſe-beans and even grains: and if a ſupply of wheat had not been received from America, the ſtate of this country would have been dreadful.

There are never wanting perſons to turn the calamities of mankind to their own advantage. Thus it was in the preſent caſe. The price of grain ſunk afterwards; but it did not ſink to the level it was at prior to the year 1756, and there has been a gradual increaſe in the price of proviſions. The richer farmers, who had ſtores of grain by them, did not feel the loſs of one year's harveſt: to many of them, indeed, it even proved beneficial, as they could diſpoſe of the grain, which they had by them, at a higher price than before; and found a plea for keeping up the price afterwards. The larger farms were now increaſed by the addition of the ſmaller ones; and while the little farmers were many of them ruined, and the poor were ſighing on account of the continued dearneſs of proviſion, the larger farmers grew wealthy; and, as their leaſes expired, the landlords raiſed their rents. The proceſs, then, was this: a bad harveſt produced ſcarcity; ſcarcity produced monopolies; monopolies wealth; and wealth an advance of rent.

As the prices of proviſion kept up, as houſe-keeping became more expenſive, as the large farmers carried the appearance of wealth, an advance in their rents ſeemed indeed reaſonable; ſo at leaſt it ſeemed to the landholders. The rents were accordingly raiſed, and an increaſe of rent held forth at the ſame time a new

* See the London Gazette for 1793.

plea to the farmer for a ſtill further increaſe in the price of proviſions, and for continuing the price of labour the ſame, though the price of proviſion had increaſed. Hence it is, that many poor labourers muſt now content themſelves with priſoners fare, bread and water: and while in priſons may be ſeen good wheaten bread, barley, oat bread, or potatoes, is frequently the portion of the poor cottager; and even this in too ſcanty a portion to ſatisfy the calls of nature. There have lately been riots in ſeveral places among the poor, on account of their low wages, and the high price of proviſion. In one or two priſons I have ſeen perſons confined on account of ſuch riots; loaded too with irons, which I think is the puniſhment of felons. One of this deſcription I ſaw in Bedford jail.

On taking a view of the years between 1756 and 1793, it would be found, that the continued high price of proviſion cannot proceed from harveſts uniformly light, or uniformly bad. It has proceeded from other cauſes; from undue advantages taken of times of ſcarcity by monopolizers, from the unreaſonable profits of farmers, from exceſſive exportation into foreign countries, from rents increaſed by landlords, in ſhort, from cauſes many of which admitted of a remedy, and which ought to have been remedied. In the article of flour, too, the millers are left too much at their own diſcretion; theſe men frequently keep flour at a high price, when the price of grain has, according to the average price, been moderate.

The high price of proviſion produces among the poor not only frequent riots, rank ſickneſſes, and various miſeries, but ſometimes even temporary immoralities. The oppreſſion and injuſtice of the wealthy, produce diſcontent and violence among the poor. Hard fare and low wages lead to pilfering and to deceit. And the ſame men, who a few years ago could purchaſe a little malt, and ſhare their wholeſome beverage with their families, are tempted to ſtint their families even of bread, to get their mug of ale at the public-houſe; for the price of malt being ſo high, the labourer is prevented from having the accuſtomed barrel at home.—What is the reaſon that ſo great a proportion of thoſe who ſuffer as criminals, is found among the poor?

This leads me to complain of what has frequently been the ſubject of juſt complaint, viz. the high price of malt. I have elſewhere obſerved, that the tax on malt is nearly equal to the land-tax: a moſt impolitic and cruel tax, which principally affects the labouring poor! The poor, therefore, muſt in general, be content with their cool beverage; nor are they likely to be cheered by a ſuperabundance of fuel, the price of which, within a very ſhort period, having experienced an immoderate advance.

Does want always produce patience? Does pinching cold always terminate in piety?

On converſing with a farmer in one of our maritime counties, of whoſe integrity I have had long proof, I am convinced that the rents of farms are frequently raiſed, where the profits will ſcarcely admit of it. When a landlord conceives that the rent of a farm ſhould be advanced, his uſual ſtep is to employ a land ſurveyor, who may indeed ſometimes be able to judge of the worth of land, having perhaps been a farmer himſelf, or being acquainted with the produce of ſome particular ſoil: yet does he not frequently live in London, and is he not ſometimes unacquainted with the buſineſs of farming? However by his teſtimony the landlord regulates his rents. And as the land ſurveyor's profits depend on his advantage to his employer, the farmer is frequently injured, and the poor labourer loſes his ſmall allowance of ſmall-beer and a meſs.

But are there no other circumſtances that may be conſidered as a plea for the preſent continued dearneſs of proviſion? May not the preſent war be taken into the account? This is a delicate, an affecting, an alarming ſubject! Paſſing by the awful teſtimonies to be gathered from the decay of commerce in our large manufacturing towns, I dwell on teſtimonies, which fall under my more immediate obſervation.

I was led to obſerve before the war, what every body acquainted with theſe matters knew to be true, that the ſpecie in England was comparatively ſmall. The ſudden decline of public credit, and the unhappy failures of men of large property gave a ſerious teſtimony to the truth of this remark. Still, however, it might have been thought, that as our exports were ſtopped, the prices of many articles might have been proportionably lowered. But it ſhould be recollected, that as the preſent war commenced on no ordinary principles of politics, its expences are to be eſtimated by no ſober rules of calculation. If public report, too, does not deal in falſehood, we are fighting rather with money than with arms: and when one nation is corrupting another, who knows what may be the coſt? Suppoſing the loſs to be on our ſide, what has been ſpent in corruption is totally loſt; and even if victory declare for England, what will England gain? Is the waſting of our ſpecie in foreign countries likely to lower the price of proviſion at home, or to make an advance in the price of labour? England pays the Germans, and corrupts the French. But what ſhall be England's reward? I leave this queſtion to be anſwered, when our millions of taxes are raiſed!

To return to my poor people. I complain that the price of labour has not advanced in proportion to the prices of proviſion: on the contrary, while moſt articles of conſumption are nearly

double the former price, and ſome even treble, that of labour continues nearly the ſame. Now, though I do not profeſs to have any average price of labour in the different counties, ſuch average might be made, and I am not ſure, though I know I am ſpeaking againſt public opinion, and perhaps from a ſlender knowledge, I ſay I am not ſure, that ſome regulation might not be made relative to the price of labour according to ſuch averages. Labour too may be interrupted, and poor families injured, by the preſent regulations for the militia. Enrolling them is ſufficient, till, from previous circumſtances, preparation becomes neneceſſary. The annual exerciſe, indeed, is unneceſſary. "For what a countryman can learn at that time, he will have to unlearn in time of ſervice*."—The militia when embodied have only the pay of the regulars, and the allowance for their families is too ſmall.

But not to inſiſt on theſe remarks, I ſtill maintain, that labourers ought to receive more wages than they commonly do, and that our farmers and manufacturers can, in general, afford to give more. I am confirmed in this remark by ſome obſervations that I made on my late excurſion. In the courſe of a year, wages have been raiſed in ſome places through which I lately paſſed two-pence a day, without any inconvenience to the farmers; yet in the very next villages, perhaps, labour keeps at the paltry ſhilling. Now I have not heard, that there is any thing in the circumſtances of the farms, in the latter caſe, to prevent this trifling advance. Indeed, if I am not wrongly informed, (I repeat what I have obſerved before) in ſome places wages are even as low as ten-pence. I ſpeak cautiouſly, becauſe this has not fallen under my own obſervation; and becauſe the caſes alluded to, may probably be thoſe in which men are employed by the pariſh, or have applied to farmers in a way of *rounding*, in which caſes they are paid leſs than the regular price. It was not, however, intimated, that either of theſe was the caſe; and the account was received from more perſons than one; taken indeed from thoſe corn counties where the price of labour is as low, I believe, as any where in England; ſome parts of Hertfordſhire, Cambridgeſhire, Huntingdonſhire, Bedfordſhire, Somerſetſhire. In Norfolk, I think, where the farms are to a proverb good, a day-labourer receives from eight to ten ſhillings a week: and in many other counties, more wages are received than in the above counties. In Ireland and in Wales three ſhillings only. That I may not be thought to have marked things too ſtrongly, I juſt obſerve, that the above account relates to labourers who work by the day or week; thoſe who work by

* Advice to the Lord Lieutenants of counties, commanding regiments of militia.

the

the *great*, as they call it, earn more; but then they muſt work more.

One great end of religion, is to teach people patience; that of political inveſtigation, to point out grievances, to provoke inquiries, to propoſe remedies. A book of complaints, therefore, is not a religious book; nor is it the more difficult part of political inveſtigation; the more difficult is to find remedies; but the moſt difficult of all, is to get reduced to practice, what appears reaſonable in theory.

If the price of proviſion may be kept up through the reduction of ſmall farms, through the extravagant appearance and profits of farmers, through a conſequent riſe in their rents by landlords, through avaricious monopolies and greedy ſpeculations, through injudicious and frequently cruel incloſures, through tithing the whole produce of the country, through the preſent rage for cutting up large portions of rich arable land for canals, through holding out bounties to exports, through ſhackling trade and manufactures, through the waſting of public money, through the extravagancies and luxuries of individuals, through impolitic wars, and the arts of corruption, I ſay, to whatever cauſe the continued high price of proviſion may be aſſigned, it is a ſerious evil, and every effort ſhould be made to redreſs it. Indeed, when the price of proviſions has been for a courſe of years above its juſt level, and when the price of labour has been long underrated through a whole ſyſtem of improprieties, I foreſee the difficulty of bringing things right, and what means Providence may take to remove the complaints of the poor, for there is juſtice as well as mercy in heaven, I preſume not to ſay. Government, however, ſhould uſe its beſt efforts, individuals ſhould not be wanting in theirs. This, I venture to ſay, is even the part of prudence.

Whether the board of agriculture, under the direction of a man of an enlarged mind, and much acquainted with agriculture, may not have very uſeful tendencies, I do not preſume to ſay; I ſpeak with caution, apprehenſive I own, that even a board of agriculture may eventually, like other boards, end in a job; and yet I ſpeak with hope, encouraged by many judicious hints held forth by Sir John Sinclair *. Whether too the legiſlature would not do well to reconſider once more the act† for regulating the importation and exportation of corn, may be worth conſideration. To allow the exportation of corn may encourage, I own, the farmer to improvements in agriculture; but to encourage it by bounties, may be attended with ſerious conſequences. Indeed,

* See Sir John Sinclair's Addreſs to the Board of Agriculture.
† 31 George III.

the legiſlature hath already perceived this; and accordingly it has ſeen the expediency of reſtraining exports, notwithſtanding the 31ſt Geo. II. when the price of corn exceeds a certain average*: but ſhould not bounties be entirely taken off? Ought not too the exorbitant tax on malt to be taken off, or exchanged for one leſs oppreſſive to the labourious poor? When acts are paſſed for encloſing waſtes and commons, ſhould not the poor man's cottage be ſpared? And amidſt the numerous acts that are paſſing relative to canals, ſhould not enquiries be made how far, though productive to individuals, they may injure land carriage, and damage agriculture? Should not the drawbacks on ſugar be taken off, or, indeed, might not the uſe of Weſt India ſugar be entirely left off? it is the price of blood!—Wiſe is that nation that can convert inſtruments of war into implements of induſtry!—and may Heaven haſten the period, when nations ſhall learn war no more!

If public opinion cannot eaſily be corrected, let individuals, at leaſt, conſult the comfort of individuals. Let not the rich ſuffer their ſervants to *give any price for* an article of conſumption; this will infallibly make it dear. Let the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table be carefully taken up, and let the maſter or miſtreſs direct the diſpoſal of them. Let no ſervant be allowed to ſell them. Theſe are the gleanings of a full crop, that the poor ought to carry away gratis. The rich ſhould keep a leſs number of dogs and horſes, till the poor are better provided for. When hams are ſtewed down to make ketchup of, let ſervants be charged not to throw the fleſh to the dogs, or at leaſt, which is ſometimes done, to the dunghill. Let the man who conſumes a pound of fine flour each day in powder, recollect, that the poor cottager, perhaps, cannot get a morſel of wheaten bread †. The National Convention have even aboliſhed the uſe of powder.

With a view to awaken the compaſſionate feelings of private perſons, as well as of our governors (if this pamphlet ſhould happen to fall into their hands), I beg leave to hint, paſſing by the failures of ſome of our principal manufacturers at Birmingham, Mancheſter, &c. what has fallen under my more immediate obſervation, and comes within the limits of this publication. I drop the hint as the teſtimony of one more individual againſt the continuance of the preſent war. In ſeveral villages, where the ſpinners could get a ſhilling for Jerſey-ſpinning before the war, they were taken off three-pence when the war broke out. In thoſe very villages, one of which I have lately viſited, in Hun-

* 33 Geo. III.

† I am indebted for ſome of theſe hints, to a pamphlet referred to above, Conſiderations on the High Price of Grain, by Catharine Phillips.

tingdonſhire,

kingdonſhire, five-pence are now taken off, in ſome ſixpence, and even ſeven-pence. So that in many places the poor, if they can poſſibly help it, will not ſpin at all. There is indeed no ſale for the yarn: and on converſing with a gentleman who has large concerns in the wool-trade, and in whoſe county I met with many ſpinners who had ſeven-pence in the ſhilling taken off, he aſſured me he ſhould loſe in the courſe of the laſt ſix months, a thouſand pounds by the war, and ſome had already loſt four or five.

Let thoſe, then, who thrive by the impoveriſhment of the nation, ſpeak the praiſes of the preſent war. Let them ſpeak its praiſes at a time, when, if I am not wrongly informed, the miniſter himſelf begins to feel its impolicy, and to ſigh over its miſeries. But the trading part of the community ſhould know that the proſperity of Britain depends on commerce and agriculture; which could only flouriſh by our keeping ourſelves out of the preſent war: and even thoſe who have been unwilling to know it, on account of certain declarations which they had ſigned, (for I can aſſign no other reaſon), muſt, I apprehend, begin to feel it; and if Britain is not wiſe in time, will, I fear, feel it ſtill more. So impolitic and imprudent an appearance did engaging in war, in our preſent circumſtances, appear to a friend of mine, that in a ſenſible little pamphlet, publiſhed by that friend, before we had committed ourſelves for war, it is obſerved, that if we committed ourſelves, it muſt be for ſome *unavowed reaſon*, and that there was reaſon to fear it would end in the total ruin of our finances *. The truth is, that independently of the queſtion on the juſtice of our cauſe, for we are at preſent off our original ground, there are many circumſtances relative to our agriculture, manufactures, foreign commerce, and public funds, that made our uniting with the bankrupt powers of Europe peculiarly hazardous, connected with the moſt dreadful experiments, to thoſe particularly whoſe property was veſted in the funds, and depended on public ſecurities. No calamity, as a good writer has obſerved, ſo ſevere and ſo extenſive ever befel the commerce of this country †!—I do not conſider myſelf to have wandered from my ſubject, and have purpoſely avoided ſaying much; having ſaid indeed elſewhere, that I would ſay nothing on this ſubject: but thus much I could not help ſaying: for what ſo eſſentially affects the monied and commercial intereſt of this country, muſt go like an electrical ſhot through the country, and be felt, and powerfully too, in the poor man's dwelling, as will appear from what I have already ſaid, and might be made ſtill further to appear from the deplorable

* Two letters, entitled, Twopenny Worth of Truth for a Penny, or a true ſtate of Facts, with an Apology for Tom Bull, in a letter to Brother John

† See a letter to Mr. Pitt, by Jaſper Wilſon, Eſq. and Thoughts on the Cauſes of the preſent Failures,

ſtate

ſtate of ſo many thouſand of poor Spittal-fields weavers, and manufacturers of Birmingham and elſewhere.—But to return.

To what I have ſaid on the wool-trade, I muſt add, that in moſt of our corn counties, in thoſe at leaſt in which I have been, Bedfordſhire, Huntingdonſhire, and ſome parts of Cambridgeſhire, though the crops of wheat this year have been plentiful, yet there is little ſtraw, and the other crops are light: ſo that I have heard both farmers and labourers in many places aſk, What will the poor do for work in the winter? The corn will be ſoon thraſhed out. In England the harveſt has, in general, been good; in Scotland bad.—I paſs from theſe reflections, to drop a hint on the management of workhouſes.

From what I have already hinted, it will appear, that I think theſe bad inſtitutions, unwiſe regulations ariſing out of an imperfect police; however, while they exiſt, every attempt to render the poor in them as comfortable as poſſible, is laudable.—If it could be avoided, for in ſeveral pariſhes in London where there are few poor, this cannot well be avoided, at leaſt according to our preſent ſyſtem of ſupporting the poor; if it could be avoided, I ſay, the poor ought not to be farmed. The poor lie too much at the mercy of the maſter of the workhouſe when they are farmed. Neither ſhould the maſter's ſalary be regulated according to his *prudential* management. If the maſter's ſalary is in proportion to his *ſparing* the pariſh, the poor will, moſt probably, be oppreſſed. His ſalary ſhould be fixed, and a committee of the moſt independent gentlemen be appointed to direct the ſupplies. This committee ſhould meet at the workhouſe *to do buſineſs*, and ſpend none of the poor's money in entertainments. Of this committee, one or two gentlemen in rotation ſhould viſit the houſe, but not at *ſtated* periods, to examine the proviſion, weights, bedding, &c. and to hear the complaints of the poor, and of the maſter. Rules ought to be hung up in a place where they may be generally inſpected.—There is an act of parliament that directs this for priſons.—Theſe hints I drop in conſequence of certain excellent rules which I ſaw hung up in a workhouſe at a market town in Royſton, Hertfordſhire.

He is the greateſt philanthropiſt who enables the poor man to help himſelf, and that poor man, who is diſpoſed to do ſo, ſhews both wiſdom and virtue. On this principle, much praiſe is, I think, due to certain ſocieties in the metropolis, and different parts of the country, called, provident ſocieties, friendly ſocieties, and the like.

At a time when we are ſurrounded with public and private calamities, when ſo many men of property have been cruſhed, and ſo many thouſands of our poor are ſtarving, let the rich conſider it as their duty to ſtretch out the hand of benevolence. Should

not

not avarice produce ſomething from her hoard? ſhould not luxury retrench ſomething from her expence? ſhould not pleaſure ſacrifice ſomething of her diſſipation? Should not too the religioniſt be taught (the truly religious are taught this already) that there is ſomething more grateful to the Deity, and more beneficial to mankind, than the offerings of the lip, or the mere formality of hearing ſermons?

About eighteen hundred years ago, there appeared at Jeruſalem an extraordinary perſon, who put a queſtion to ſome of his countrymen, Who is neighbour to the man that falls among thieves? This teacher went about *doing good*; even as the ſon of man came not to be miniſtered unto, but to miniſter, and gave his life a ranſom for many. Moſt of the powers of Europe call this perſon their TEACHER, their SAVIOUR, their GOD! Yet moſt of theſe powers are at this inſtant CUTTING ONE ANOTHER'S throats!

CHAP. IV.——TABLE I.

ADDRESS of the LADIES who have formed themſelves into a Society for the Education of Poor Female Children, by inſtituting a Charity School and Sunday School in Walworth.

THE importance of education is a ſubject on which the wiſe and virtuous of every age have been agreed, and the dreadful effects of the ignorance, both of moral and religious duties, among the poor, are too glaring to need deſcription; but to expect the diſcharge of thoſe duties from perſons who have never been informed of their obligation, would be as reaſonable as to expect the earth to produce a harveſt though no ſeed had been previouſly ſown.

It is an acknowledged fact that ignorance and indolence are the parents of every vice. To reſcue children from theſe fatal evils, to teach them their duty towards their Creator and their fellow-creatures, and train them up in habits of induſtry, will, it is hoped, be of unſpeakable advantage to themſelves, and eſſential benefit to ſociety.

The principles and conduct of women in the lower rank of life, are intimately connected with the happineſs of families; it is therefore deſirable to implant in the minds of young females thoſe principles which may ſecure them from the various dangers to which they will inevitably be expoſed.

Influenced by theſe conſiderations, ſeveral Ladies have formed themſelves into a Society for the education of poor Girls—they intend to eſtabliſh a CHARITY SCHOOL for a limited number—and a SUNDAY SCHOOL, with a view to confer on a larger number

ber the benefit of learning to read. But as they are not ſufficiently numerous to render the inſtitution ſo extenſively uſeful as they would wiſh, they reſpectfully ſolicit the concurrence and ſupport of other ladies who may be diſpoſed to encourage ſo benevolent a deſign. To promote this end, there may be a propriety in mentioning, that the inſtitution will be conducted upon a liberal plan, and no preference ſhewn to any particular religious denomination.

The Rules for the general government of the Walworth Female Charity and Sunday Schools.

That the annual contribution of half a guinea, a guinea, or upwards, ſhall conſtitute a lady a ſubſcriber.

That a general meeting of the ſubſcribers be held the firſt Wedneſday after every quarter-day.

That a committee of ten Ladies, a Treaſurer, and Secretary, be elected annually by ballot.—The Treaſurer and a Secretrary to be members of the Committee.

That the accounts of the Treaſurer be audited by the Committee, previous to their being laid before the General Meeting in January.

That the committee meet once in every month, and that their meetings be open to every ſubſcriber.

That every ſubſcriber ſhall be requeſted to viſit the ſchools for a week in her turn, and not leſs than twice in the courſe of that time, and report the ſtate of the ſchool to the committee at their next meeting.—That any ſubſcriber, however, to whom viſiting the ſchools in perſon may be inconvenient, is at liberty to appoint a daughter or a friend, (provided her friend be a ſubſcriber) but that the lady ſubſtituted ſhall make the like report to the committee.

That the members of the committee viſit the ſchools once a week in rotation, and report to the committee.

That the treaſurer and ſecretary viſit the ſchools prior to every quarterly meeting, and report their opinion upon the conduct of the miſtreſs, and improvement and behaviour of the children.

DAY SCHOOL.

That girls be admitted from eight years of age to eleven, and be put out to ſervice at fourteen—the ladies will, it is hoped, exert themſelves to provide with ſuitable places the girls whom they preſent.

That in order to educate girls in a manner that may fit them for ſervants, they be taught plain-work, knitting, reading and writing,

writing, and (that they may learn to be neat in their perſons) to make and mend their own clothes in ſchool.

That for the purpoſe of teaching the girls houſhold work, they ſhall, in their turn, as ſoon as they are thought capable, do the work of the miſtreſs's houſe.

The ſociety propoſe giving the girls every neceſſary article of clothing, as far as the finances of the charity will admit; the clothes which they give the firſt year ſhall be taken care of by the miſtreſs and uſed only on Sundays, and when the children are new clothed, they ſhall have the clothes of the preceding year to come to ſchool in.

That every lady who is a ſubſcriber on the ſixth of March next, ſhall be at liberty to preſent a child in her turn, taking the names in alphabetical order; and that every lady who ſubſcribes after that time, ſhall have the right of preſenting in the order in which ſhe ſubſcribes.

SUNDAY SCHOOL.

That the ſcholars ſhall attend at the ſchool on Sundays from eight to ten, in the morning; from one to two, at noon; and from five to ſeven, in the evening; and ſhall accompany the children of the day ſchool, under the care of the miſtreſs, to public worſhip in the morning and afternoon.

Ladies are requeſted (thoſe more particularly who reſide at Walworth) to viſit the ſunday ſchool as often as is in their power, as it is apprehended that frequent viſiting of the ſchools is eſſential to their ſucceſs.

Any further information may be obtained by applying to Mrs. Arnold, No. 2, Richmond-place, Eaſt-ſtreet, Walworth; or Mrs. Beddome, No. 170, Fenchurch-ſtreet, who will receive ſubſcriptions, and very gratefully acknowledge any contributions towards promoting the deſign of the Charity.

Walworth, February 26, 1793.

N. B. This Addreſs to be had of Mrs. Gurney, bookſeller, Holborn.

TABLE

TABLE II.

Articles for the regulation of a Charity School, at Bury St. Edmund's.

The deſign of theſe Charity Schools is to inſtruct ſixty poor boys in reading, writing, and arithmetic, for four years, during which time they are to be employed in ſpinning alſo, and to be clothed from the profits of their reſpective earnings; and after the expiration of that term, to be bound apprentices to ſome uſeful trades.

And thirty poor girls in reading, knitting, and ſewing, for four years, viz. for the two firſt years in knitting, and for the two laſt in ſewing; the profits ariſing from their work to be laid out in clothing them.

Rules and Orders for the government of theſe Charity Schools.

THAT eleven of the ſubſcribers ſhall be choſen ſtewards, who ſhall be empowered to give all ſuch orders and directions as they ſhall think fit for the regulation of the ſchools; and that five of theſe may conſtitute a committee, to tranſact any buſineſs relating thereto.

And that the Alderman, and the preaching miniſters, (if ſubſcribers) be always of the number of the ſtewards.

That there ſhall be annually choſen a receiver, who ſhall give a fair account of all receipts and diſburſements of money ready for the view of the contributors, or any other perſons who may deſire to know how this charity is conducted; and that the accounts of the receiver ſhall be laid before the ſtewards, and ſettled by them every year, at a general meeting on the Tueſday before Chriſtmas-day.

That there be a general meeting of the ſtewards and contributors at the Guildhall on the laſt Tueſday in every month, immediately after evening prayers, when the maſters and the miſtreſs of the ſchools ſhall attend with the children, and give a particular account how many children they have under their care, how they have behaved, and what progreſs they have made in their learning; and the writing-maſter ſhall produce ſome ſpecimens of the boys writing.

That every day, half of the number of the boys be employed at one ſchool in reading, writing, and arithmetic; half at the other ſchool in ſpinning, and that alternately.

N. B. *The idea on ſpinning might be extended to other articles of trade, on the plan of the Philanthropic Society in St. George's Fields, London.*

That no boy be admitted into theſe ſchools under the age of nine years, unleſs the ſtewards ſhall ſee a reaſon for the contrary; and

and that the parents or friends of every boy who applies for admiſſion, ſhall bring with them a note out of the pariſh regiſter-book to certify his age. And that no boy be admitted before he has been taught to ſpin.

That the parents or friends of the children take care to ſend them to the ſchools clean and neat—that they ſet them good examples at home, and ſuffer them not to beg, on pain of expulſion.

That the maſter of the reading and writing ſchool ſhall be allowed twenty ſhillings a year for every boy that he teaches, and a chaldron of coals. The maſter of the ſpinning-ſchool twenty-nine pounds a year for his ſalary; and the miſtreſs of the girls ſchool ſhall be allowed at the rate of three ſhillings and three-pence a quarter for each, whilſt they are taught to knit; and four ſhillings a quarter for each, when they learn to ſew.

That the maſters and miſtreſs ſhall conſtantly attend their proper buſineſs in their reſpective ſchools, during the time appointed for teaching, viz. the reading and writing-maſter, and the miſtreſs of the girls ſchool, from ſeven to eleven of the clock in the morning, and from one to five in the afternoon, from the 10th of February to the 10th of October; and from eight to eleven in the morning, and from one to four of the clock in the afternoon, the other part of the year, Saturdays only excepted, when the children may be allowed to leave thoſe ſchools at four in the afternoon, throughout the whole year; but the boys muſt not be allowed to leave the ſpinning ſchool any day, until they have finiſhed the taſks ſeverally appointed them.

That the maſter and miſtreſs ſhall call over the names of all the children in their reſpective ſchools every morning and evening, to know whether they attend regularly at the time appointed; and if any of them do not ſo attend, that they give notice thereof in the evening to the receiver, who may immediately expel ſuch defaulters, unleſs their parents or friends aſſign ſome ſufficient reaſon for their abſence from ſchool.

N. B. *I leave out what relates to catechiſing, &c. it being my opinion that religion ſhould make no part of the education of public ſchools, but be left to the parents of the children, or miniſters.*

That the maſters and miſtreſs take particular care of the morals and behaviour of the children, and by proper methods diſcourage and puniſh the beginnings of all vices in them, particularly thoſe of lying, ſwearing, and profaning the Lord's day.

That they permit not the children to break up more than three times in the year, viz. at Chriſtmas, Eaſter, and Whitſuntide, and never at Bury-fair.

That the boys in the reading and writing-ſchool, and the girls under the care of the miſtreſs, have leave to be abſent from their ſchool on *Thurſdays* in the afternoon only.

That

That the maſters and miſtreſs ſhall receive no money from the parents of the poor children, either on their admiſſion into the ſchools, or on their breaking up, or on account of their maundies; but that the ſtewards ſhall allow fourteen ſhillings for the boys maundies, and five ſhillings for thoſe of the girls.

TABLE III.

Articles for the regulation of a Society, intitled, the St. Ives General Provident Society, for the benefit of ſurvivors at the end of ſeven years; to be computed from the 3d of February, 1789.

It being the duty of every individual to improve his property by all lawful means, and as no ſingle perſon can propoſe to himſelf the advantage that may ariſe from collected bodies, the members of this ſociety have entered into an agreement with each other to raiſe a capital by weekly ſubſcriptions, to be divided among the ſurviving members, whoſe life or lives ſhall be exiſting at the expiration of ſeven years, in manner and under the regulations following.

IMPRIMIS,

THAT this ſociety commence on the firſt Tueſday in February, 1789, and be not confined to any number of members, but that a book be kept open for the admiſſion of all ſuch who chooſe to enter, without regard to age or ſex.

II. That ſixpence per week be ſubſcribed by each member, which ſhall be accounted a ſhare; and that any member may ſubſcribe for two or more ſhares, either on his or her own life, or the life or lives of any other perſon or perſons, and ſhall receive a dividend or dividends in the capital ſtock accordingly: but if any perſon ſhould wiſh to pay their whole ſubſcription at once, it is agreed, that any perſon paying ſeven guineas within the firſt three months, ſhall be deemed a ſubſcriber of one ſhare, and at the expiration of the ſeven years be entitled to every benefit ariſing therefrom, provided the nominee be then living.

III. That every perſon on admiſſion ſhall pay an extra ſum of ſixpence for each ſhare, for the purpoſe of defraying the expence of books, advertiſements, &c. and every perſon entering after the expiration of three months from the commencement of this ſociety, ſhall pay for entrance money the following ſums, namely, after three months one ſhilling, after four months one ſhilling and four-pence, and four-pence advance every month after for every ſhare of his or her ſubſcription, over and above the extra ſix-

pence

pence aforeſaid, and the weekly ſubſcription of ſixpence, which weekly ſubſcription is to be paid up from the commencement, to the time of entrance; and that the books ſhall be finally cloſed on the firſt Tueſday in February, 1790, and no perſon admitted afterwards.

IV. That as often as the ſubſcriptions received ſhall be ſufficient to purchaſe fifty pounds ſtock, the ſame ſhall be placed out in government ſecurities, in the name of the treaſurer herein-after mentioned, and his ſucceſſor; he ſigning an inſtrument, purporting that the ſtock, ſo bought in his name, is the ſole property of this ſociety.

V. That the Rev. *Thomas Smith*, Rev. *Francis Goodſon Panting*, Meſſrs. *James Brittin*, *Samuel Johnſon*, *John Alpreſs*, *John Moody*, *Joſeph Harris*, *Samuel Knightly*, *Robert Warner*, and *John Conſtable* of St. Ives aforeſaid, and Mr. *John Clark* of Wiggan, be, and they are hereby appointed truſtees to this ſociety; and ſhould the number of the truſt be reduced, by death or otherwiſe, the vacancy ſhall be filled up at the next monthly meeting, by a majority of the truſtees. And the above-named truſt ſhall be empowered to chooſe the treaſurer and ſecretary from time to time, as need ſhall require.

VI. That Mr. JAMES BRITTIN be, and he is hereby appointed the treaſurer of this ſociety, by giving ſuch ſecurity for the truſt repoſed in him, as the truſtees ſhall think proper.

VII. That *William Mott* of St. Ives aforeſaid, be, and he is hereby appointed the ſecretary for conducting the buſineſs of this ſociety, keeping the regular entries of the admiſſion of members, the accounts of their reſpective ſubſcriptions, and other neceſſary matters; and likewiſe to attend the acting truſtees at their reſpective meetings: and in conſideration of the trouble he muſt neceſſarily have therein, it is agreed, that he ſhall receive three-pence per annum from each member for each ſhare, to be paid at the firſt monthly meeting next after the expiration of each year.

VIII. That the firſt Tueſday in every calendar month be, and is appointed for receiving the arrears of the weekly ſubſcriptions, at the houſe of William Mott in St. Ives aforeſaid, from the hours of five to ſeven o'clock in the evening, when the books will be cloſed, and the money immediately paid to the treaſurer, for which a ſatisfactory receipt muſt be given, to be produced before the truſtees that ſame evening at W. Mott's aforeſaid, where they, or three of them at the leaſt, will attend preciſely at ſeven o'clock, to tranſact the buſineſs without any expence to the ſociety.

IX. That the firſt Tueſday in February, May, Auguſt, and November in each year, be appointed quarterly meetings, when the books ſhall be cleared of every demand; and any member neglecting to pay his or her ſubſcription, which ſhall be due at

each quarterly meeting, on or before the then next monthly meeting; he or ſhe ſhall be deprived of all benefit from this ſociety.

X. That if any member ſhall hereafter change the place of his or her abode, he or ſhe ſhall, within three months next after ſuch removal, ſend notice thereof in writing to the ſecretary, or be excluded the benefit of this ſociety; and any widow or ſpinſter marrying, ſhall, within three months next after ſuch marriage, bring or ſend a certificate thereof to the ſecretary, to be indorſed with her name; for which ſhe ſhall pay him three-pence: and that all letters relative to this ſociety muſt be directed to the ſecretary, free of expence.

XI. That at the expiration of ſeven years, all arrears ſhall be fully paid, the accounts adjuſted and finally cloſed: and every member of this ſociety living on that day at twelve o'clock at noon, ſhall have a juſt claim to his or her ſhare or ſhares of the joint ſtock of this ſociety: and that on the firſt Tueſday in March, next after the expiration of the ſeven years, each member, his or her heirs, executors, adminiſtrators or aſſigns, ſhall receive his, her, or their reſpective ſhare or ſhares without any deduction whatever. And to prevent fraud, every member muſt prove his or her identity to the ſatisfaction of the truſtees, if required.

XII. That every perſon entering into this ſociety, ſhall have a copy of theſe articles, and a certificate of his or her being a member, for which he or ſhe ſhall pay to the ſecretary three-pence, and in order to ſave trouble, each certificate ſhall have the number thereon, where ſuch ſubſcriber ſtands enrolled on the books of this ſociety, which certificate or its number, muſt be produced every time of payment, or the party ſo neglecting, ſhall forfeit one penny to the ſecretary.

XIII. That for the continual ſupport of this ſociety, and for preventing any diſputes happening hereafter, it is hereby agreed, that theſe articles ſhall remain, and be in full force during the ſaid ſeven years, without any alteration whatever; and no member ſhall have any claim upon the ſtock of this ſociety, if he or ſhe does not fulfil the articles heretofore mentioned.

N. B. Perſons deſirous of becoming members of this ſociety, may apply to any of the truſtees, or to the ſecretary.

TABLE

TABLE IV.

Rules of a Provident Society among the children of the Sunday Schools, Mare ſtreet, Hackney, eſtabliſhed October 25, 1789.

I. EVERY boy or girl belonging to the ſchools, ſhall be at liberty to become a member of this ſociety.

II. Each member ſhall bring a penny every Sunday, to be paid at the ſchool room, into the hands of the treaſurer, who ſhall keep an account of all the ſums that are received, and of all arrears.

III. Any members who neglect to pay their weekly contribution, ſhall, (unleſs good reaſon be aſſigned) for the firſt time forfeit a halfpenny; for the ſecond a penny; for the third two-pence; and for the fourth be excluded from the ſociety.

IV. No one can be admitted a member till a new year commences, unleſs he pays as many pence as the other members have paid ſince the year begun.

V. A new ſcholar may commence a member in the middle of the year; but in that caſe he can claim but half the benefit to which the others are entitled.

VI. If any ſhall leave the Sunday School, or be abſent for a month without ſufficient reaſon, they ſhall forfeit all benefit from this ſociety; and no one can claim any part of the money that he or ſhe have paid.

VII. But if any leave the ſchool upon juſtifiable reaſons, they may continue their weekly contribution to the end of the year, and in that caſe will be entitled to the ſame benefits with the reſt.

VIII. Such members of the ſociety as are ill, ſhall receive out of the common ſtock ſixpence per week, during their illneſs: and a committee of three boys and three girls, ſhall be choſen every half-year, to viſit the ſick and carry their allowance.

IX. Donations to the ſociety ſhall be put into the common ſtock, and once every year the money in the hands of the treaſurer ſhall be equally divided among the members, excepting only a ſmall ſum which ſhall be neceſſary to anſwer the uſual demands of the ſociety.

TABLE V.

The following tables I received, the firſt, marked A, from a young woman who is juſt begun houſe-keeping; the other, marked B, from a perſon who began houſe-keeping about twenty-ſix or twenty-eight years ago.

TABLE A.

Bread, ſeven-pence halfpenny a quartern loaf.
Coals are now ſixteen pence a buſhel.
N. B. Probably before the winter they will be much more; the young colliers being preſſed, and the old men will not work without increaſed wages.
Pork, from ſix-pence to ſeven-pence.
Beef, common boiling, four-pence and five-pence a pound; good roaſting beef, ſix-pence and ſeven-pence.
Mutton, breaſt of, five-pence a pound.
Soap, eight-pence a pound.
Yellow ſoap, ſeven-pence.
Starch, eight-pence a pound.
Blue, two ſhillings a pound.
Candles, eight-pence halfpenny.
Salt butter, nine-pence and ten-pence.
Loweſt lump ſugar, a ſhilling.
Moiſt ſugar, eight-pence and nine-pence.
Cheſhire cheeſe, ſeven-pence halfpenny a pound; Glouceſter, ſixpence.
Suet, ſixpence a pound.
Garden-ſtuff, dearer in general than it was.

TABLE B.

Bread, a quartern loaf, four-pence.
Coals, till within theſe ſeven years, a ſhilling a buſhel.
Pork, about four-pence halfpenny a pound.
Beef, (boiling), two-pence and two-pence halfpenny; roaſting, four-pence or four-pence halfpenny.
Beſt Cheſhire cheeſe, four-pence or four-pence halfpenny.
Glouceſter cheeſe, three-pence.
Salt butter, about five-pence; Iriſh butter, not ſo dear as it is now.
Good loaf ſugar, ſixpence.
Moiſt ſugar, two-pence halfpenny.
Beſt ſoap, about five-pence or ſix-pence.
Yellow, about four-pence.
Starch, about eight-pence.
Candles, ſeven-pence.
Houſe rent, double.

TABLE

TABLE VI.

THE articles contained in this appendix, have been printed without any regard to method, in the order in which they came to hand. Each appears to me entitled to conſideration. While this ſheet was paſſing through the preſs, I have read the account juſt publiſhed, of the trial of Thomas Muir, Eſq. jun. of Hunter's Hill, Scotland, for ſedition*. From the whole of the proceedings, it appears, that Mr. M. went to Paris, hoping to get the fate of Louis mitigated; that he was zealous in urging a parliamentary reform, by temperate, peaceable, and conſtitutional means; that he adviſed a ſociety to get various political pamphlets, in order, by hearing both ſides of the queſtion, to arrive at political truth; that he lent Mr. Paine's Rights of Man, before it was declared a libel; that he recommended Dr. Henry's Hiſtory of England, and other books; and ſpoke handſomely of Mr. Flower's book on the French Conſtitution; that before war was declared againſt Britain, he ſpoke in reſpectful terms of the ſucceſs of the French arms, and the liberty of the French nation; that, on the evidence of a domeſtic, he ſpoke favourably of every man's having a vote for a member of parliament, of members being paid for attendance, as they were once in England, and now are in France; and of what the conſequence would be, viz. that we ſhould be repreſented by honeſt men; that he ſent his ſervant to order an organiſt to play *Ca ira* in the ſtreets, &c. &c. &c. Such are his crimes! From the teſtimony of Lord Henderland, and Lord Juſtice Clerk, it appears, that Mr. M. is a gentleman of great reſpectability, from education, profeſſion, talents, and virtues. Mr. M. is ſentenced to tranſportation for fourteen years, with a certification of death if he return till the expiration of that period! At the cloſe of this gentleman's elegant and ſpirited addreſs to the court, an unanimous burſt of applauſe was expreſſed by the audience.—There are men who may be materially injured, but cannot be eſſentially hurt: who, after various aſſaults, can retire to a citadel that is inacceſſible, invulnerable. "The records of this trial will paſs down to poſterity; and the impartial voice of future times rejudge the verdict."—In the Chronicle for Sept. 27, there is a letter addreſſed to the Lord Juſtice Clerk, ſigned by an Engliſh lawyer, maintaining, that Mr. M. had not a LEGAL TRIAL.—In Mr. Frend's trial, at Cambridge †, there are unqueſtionably, numerous informalities.—Rev. Mr. Palmer, of Dundee, for the publication of a *ſeditious* handbill, has been alſo indicted at Perth, in Scotland. It appears he publiſhed an addreſs to the people, written by another perſon, on the ſubject of a parliamentary reform.

* Printed for Ridgway and Simonds. † To be printed for Robinſons.

Mr.

Mr. P. is ſentenced to tranſportation beyond the ſeas for ſeven years! If he return before that period he is to ſuffer death. This gentleman I know to be poſſeſſed of integrity, benevolence, and reſpectable talents. I hope I ſhall not err in preſenting the reader with his addreſs to the court, which I copy from the Courier for September 25.

" My Lords,

" I can appeal with conſcious ſincerity to the great Searcher of hearts, for the good intentions and uprightneſs of my conduct.

" My life has for many years been employed in the diſſemination of what I thought religious and moral truths, of truths which I conceived of the greateſt importance to my fellow-creatures. My friends know with what ardour I have done this, at the total ſacrifice of all worldly intereſt. But, during the late general political diſcuſſions that have taken place, it was impoſſible for a man of my ſanguine temper to be an unconcerned by-ſtander.

" I felt as all around me felt. I partook of the general influence. I perceived too, I thought, that politics were a great branch of morals, if they did not comprehend the whole of our duty to our neighbour. Would our ſuperiors, my Lords, would all mankind but do to one another what they in like circumſtances would wiſh to be done to themſelves, our petitions would have been anſwered, and every grievance redreſſed. My Lords, I conſider my politics as the cauſe of common juſtice, the cauſe of benevolence, and the cauſe of human happineſs. It was under the influence of theſe conſiderations that I entered among the Friends of the People. I thought that a parliamentary reform would enhance the happineſs of millions, and eſtabliſh the ſecurity of the empire. For theſe reaſons, too, I joined the ſociety of low weavers and mechanics, as you call them, at the Berean meeting-houſe, Dundee, and aſſented to the publication of this hand-bill, to re-animate the exertions of our fellow-citizens. The declaration or teſt of the ſociety, and all their endeavours, as far as I know, were ſolely confined to theſe ſingle objects, a ſhorter duration of parliament, and a more equal repreſentation of the people. It is not the firſt time, my Lords, that I have ſuffered in endeavouring to benefit others. For this I have borne ſhame, odium, reproach, and diminution of fortune. I truſt to God, that it is my utmoſt ambition, and has been the uniform tenor of my life, to endeavour to add to the ſum of human happineſs; and if in this beſt of cauſes, I am called again to the like or more ſevere trials, I truſt, through the help of that Great Being whom I ſerve, I ſhall ſuffer not only with courage, but with cheerfulneſs; in the pleaſing hope, that my ſufferings will not be loſt, but be as efficacious to the general good, as my moſt active exertions.

" I may

"I may perhaps be out of time, if I mention one circumſtance more. I am ſorry, that my counſel did not call [here Mr. Palmer named three witneſſes whom he had ſummoned in exculpation] to prove that Mealmaker declared to them, that he wrote every word of this addreſs, without any aſſiſtance whatever."

No reflections that I could make would give force to this addreſs; none could diminiſh its weight.

FINIS.

Lately publiſhed,

Price THREE SHILLINGS,

POEMS,

By G. Dyer, B. A. late of Emanuel College, Cambridge.

Sold by J. Johnſon, St. Paul's Church-yard.

Where may be had, price 6s. 6d. by the ſame Author, An INQUIRY into the NATURE OF SUBSCRIPTION TO THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES, in reference to the natural rights of mankind—the powers of the human mind—the principles of the britiſh conſtitution—and the doctrines and precepts of chriſtianity. Second edition, corrected, altered, and much enlarged; with a preface and index.

ERRATA.

Page 25, eight lines from the bottom, after *only*, insert *each*.

—— 31, thirteen lines from the bottom, for *Cheſter*, read *Lancaſter*.

—— 90, ſix lines from the top, for *is*, read *are*.

—— 32, ſpeaking of the manner in which the royal poſſeſſions at Hanover *might be a bleſſing to this country*, I wiſh to correct myſelf.

—— 63, ſeven lines from the bottom—I apprehend I have been miſled, relative to what I ſay on *horſe beef*; having ſince heard, that in many ſhips it is no unuſual thing to call the very coarſe pieces *horſe beef*.

—— 103, 104, I have not ſufficiently ſtudied the queſtion on canals, to form a decided opinion on the ſubject. On converſing ſince with one or two judicious friends, indeed, I rather incline to the opinion, that to a certain extent, canals may be beneficial to agriculture. I leave my mind open to inſtruction on this ſubject.

BRITISH MUSEUM